NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Wednesday, October 31, 2001, 1:30 p.m.
Video Conference Sites:
MAIN LOCATION - STATE CAPITOL BUILDING - Room 1507, Lincoln, Nebraska
KEARNEY PUBLIC LIBRARY - 2020 1st Avenue, Information Center-2nd Floor, Kearney, Nebraska
PANHANDLE LEARNING CENTER - 4502 Avenue I, High Plains Room, Scottsbluff, Nebraska

AGENDA

(**Bolded** * indicates action items)

1:30 p.m.	Call to Order and Roll Call - Lieutenant Governor Heineman
1:35 p.m.	Notice of Meeting & Approval of June 13, 2001 minutes - Lt. Gov. Heineman
1:40 p.m.	Public Comment
1:45 p.m.	Report from the Councils, Technical Panel and Staff 1. Community Council – Anne Byers or Council Co-Chairs a. Council Report b. Council Priorities - timelines c. Community and Rural IT Development Planning Group d. **Community Technology Fund Guidelines*** 2. Education Council – Tom Rolfes or Council Co-Chairs a. Council Report b. Council Priorities - timelines c. Distance Education Network Completion Grant Update (LB833) d. Telecommunication Training Grants Report 3. State Government Council – Steve Schafer a. Council Report b. Council Priorities - timelines c. **Government Technology Collaboration Fund Grant Approvals*** d. Revisions to Planning and Project Management Guidelines - Agency Comprehensive Information Technology Plans - Guidance on Project Proposal Forms for IT Budget Requests e. E-government Conference (co-sponsorship) 4. Technical Panel – Walter Weir a. Technical Panel Report b. Technical Panel Priorities - timelines c. **Accessibility Standards*** d. **Security Procedures/Templates for Handbooks** - **Computer Users Security Handbook*** - **IS Technology Staff Handbook*** - **Security Officer Instruction Guide Handbook*** e. Video Standards Updates
2:45 p.m.	Information Technology Infrastructure Fund 1. CJIS Project Plan 2. Wireless Project Plan 3. NIS Update
3:15 p.m.	NETCOM Update
4:00 p.m.	New Business - Lt. Governor Heineman
4:10 p.m.	Next Meeting Date, Location and Time - Lt. Governor Heineman
4:15 p.m.	Adjournment

October 15, 2001 - The N.I.T.C. meeting notice was posted to the N.I.T.C. and Public Meeting Calendar Web sites.
October 18, 2001 - The N.I.T.C. meeting agenda was posted to the N.I.T.C. and Public Meeting Calendar Web sites.
October 23, 2001 - A slightly revised agenda and document links to meeting documents were posted to the web sites.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Wednesday, June 13, 2001, 1:30 p.m.
State Capitol Building, Room 1507
Lincoln, Nebraska

PROPOSED MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

David I. Maurstad, Lieutenant Governor, Chair
Greg Adams, Mayor, City of York
Merill Bryan, Senior Vice President & Chief Information Officer, Union Pacific
Dr. Eric Brown, Manager, KRVN Radio
Dr. Doug Christensen, Commissioner, State Department of Education
Hod Kosman, CEO, Platte Valley Financial Services
Gary Kuck, CEO, Centurion International

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Dr. L. Dennis Smith, President, University of Nebraska
Pamela Vanlandingham, Senior Vice President, General Manager, Statement Processing Center, CGS Systems, Inc.

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL AND MEETING NOTICE

The Chair, Lieutenant Governor David Maurstad, called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. Roll call was taken. Seven members were present. A quorum existed to conduct official business. Lieutenant Governor Maurstad stated the meeting notice and agenda were posted to the NITC and Public Meeting Calendar Web sites on Tuesday, June 5, 2001. A revised agenda with links to the meeting materials was posted to the same Web sites on Thursday, June 7, 2001.

APPROVAL OF APRIL AND MAY MEETING MINUTES

There were no corrections or additions to the April 25, 2001 and May 23, 2001 meeting minutes. The minutes were approved as presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

COMMUNITY COUNCIL REPORT
Anne Byers, Community Information Technology Manager

After reviewing and updating the Council's priorities and action plans, the Community Council proposed the following Community Council Charter revisions:

1. *Representation.* We are proposing reorganizing the work of the Community Council around three workgroups. In addition to an existing subcommittee on telehealth, the Council is forming a rural and community IT planning group and a local government and libraries subcommittee. The Council has proposed reorganizing the membership around these three subcommittees. Currently, the membership is organized around six sectors: agriculture, business, health, local government, libraries, and resource providers. The Council feels organizing membership around issues rather than sectors makes more sense. Revisions regarding representation were made to sections 1 Introduction, 5.2.2 Council Responsibilities, 6.1 Number of Members, and 6.2 Representation.
2. *Number of Members.* In order to better respond to emerging issues, the Community Council recommended that the charter allow some flexibility in the number of members representing each subcommittee and the total number of members. The revised charter specifies that the Community Council be comprised of 18-24 members. The Community Council indicated that the process of having new members approved by the NITC provides adequate oversight of the council's membership. Revisions regarding the number of members were made to sections 1 Introduction, 6.1 Number of Members, 6.2 Representation, and 7.2 Quorum.
3. *Meeting Frequency.* Because of the time commitment involved in participating in subcommittees, the Community Council recommended meeting quarterly rather than monthly. Revisions regarding meeting frequency were made

to sections 1 Introduction, 7.4 Meeting Frequency, and 7.5.7. Subcommittee Process.

4. *Subcommittee Membership.* The original charter limited the membership of a subcommittee to less than a quorum of the Community Council. Since our subcommittees are comprised of many representatives outside of the Community Council, this size limitation is too restrictive. Revisions to Section 7.5.4 removed this limitation.
5. *Subcommittee Leadership.* The original charter allowed for subcommittees to be facilitated only by a single chair. Revisions to Section 7.5.5 allow subcommittees to select co-chairs.

Ms. Byers entertained questions and comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Adams moved to approve the Community Council Charter modifications and reorganized membership. Commissioner Christensen seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Adams-Yes, Brown-Yes, Bryan-Yes, Christensen-Yes, Kosman-Yes, Kuck-Yes, and Maurstad-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

Council membership. Commissioners reviewed a list of current and proposed members. The Council nominated two additional members for the health sector. Both are current members of the Telehealth Subcommittee.

- Bruce Thiel, BryanLGH Medical Center, Manager of Multi-media and Telehealth Services, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- Lennis Benson, Director of Diagnostic Imaging, Faith Regional Health Services in Norfolk, Nebraska.

Commissioner Christensen moved approval of the Community Council's nominations for two new members. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Maurstad-Yes, Kuck-Yes, Kosman-Yes, Christensen-Yes, Bryan-Yes, Brown-Yes, and Adams-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

EDUCATION COUNCIL REPORT
Tom Rolfes, Education Information Technology Manager

The Council continues to meet monthly. The Training Advisory Work group is currently reviewing the telecommunications training grants for recommendation to the NETC. A summer planning retreat is scheduled for July to review application processes and guidelines. On May 11th, the Operations Work Group completed the recommendations for the NEB*SAT fee structure. The recommendations were forwarded to the NETC and were approved at the May NETC meeting. The new policies will begin January 2002. The Policies, Procedures and Planning Work Group has not met.

After reviewing and updating the charter, priorities and action plans, the Council proposed the following Education Council Charter revision:

Section 3, Authority, to read:

3. Authority

The authority for the Education Council of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission is derived from Section 6-7 of LB924 passed April 1998. The Commission shall: "Establish ad hoc technical advisory groups to study and make recommendations on specific topics, including work groups to establish, coordinate, and prioritize needs for education, local communities, and state agencies[.]" NEB. REV. STAT. § 86-1506(7).

"Information technology means computing and telecommunications systems, their supporting infrastructure, and interconnectivity used to acquire, transport, process, analyze, store, and disseminate information electronically." NEB. REV. STAT. § 86-1504(2)

Commissioner Bryan moved to approve the Education Council's Charter modifications. Commissioner Kuck seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Brown-Yes, Bryan-Yes, Christensen-Yes, Kosman-Yes, Kuck-Yes, Maurstad-Yes, and Adams-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

Council membership. The Education Council would like to recommend the following persons to serve on the Council for the term July 1, 2001-June 30, 2003.

Higher Education Membership Term Renewals:

- Dr. William Berndt, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs UNMC representing public universities,

- Mr. Con Dietz, Vice President, Information Systems, Creighton University, representing private & independent universities,
- Dr. Jack Huck, President, Southeast Community College (New Alternate: Dr. George Mihel, President College Mid-Plains Community College) representing community colleges, and
- Dr. Tom Krepel, President, Chadron State College representing state colleges

K-12 Membership Term Renewals:

- Mr. Joe LeDuc, Education Technology Specialist, Lincoln Catholic Diocese representing private/parochial K-12 teachers
- Mr. Al Schneider, Administrator, ESU 5 representing ESUs

K-12 Membership New Members:

- Dr. Ed Rastovski, Superintendent, Wahoo Public Schools representing administrators (replacing Larry Bock)
- Ms. Linda Engel, Coordinator of Instructional Technology, Nebraska City Public Schools representing teachers (replacing Art Tanderup)

Commissioner Kosman moved to approve the Education Council's nominations for renewed and new members. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Kuck-Yes, Kosman-Yes, Christensen-Yes, Bryan-Yes, Brown-Yes, Adams-Yes, and Maurstad-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL REPORT
Steve Schafer, Chief Information Officer, State of Nebraska

Mr. Schafer reported that the Council has been meeting regularly. The next meeting is scheduled for June 14th.

Charter modifications. After reviewing the Council's charter, priorities and action plans, the Council proposed the following State Government Council Charter Revisions:

1. Definition of Information Technology in Section 3. In Section 3, Authority, insert the following:

   "Information technology means computing and telecommunications systems, their supporting infrastructure, and interconnectivity used to acquire, transport, process, analyze, store, and disseminate information electronically." Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-1504(2)

2. Responsibilities change. Amend Section 5.2, Council Responsibilities, as follows:

   5.2.7 Recommend policies, guidelines, and standards for ~~improving the organization and management of data~~ information technology within state.

Commissioner Kuck moved to approve the State Government Council's Charter modifications as presented. Commissioner Bryan seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Bryan-Yes, Christensen-Yes, Kosman-Yes, Kuck-Yes, Maurstad-Yes, Adams-Yes, and Brown-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

Government Technology Collaboration Fund Grant Guidelines. The guidelines are very similar to the previous two cycles. In addition to $250,000 there is roughly $125,000 from the previous year. The Government Council recommends that the Government Technology Collaboration Fund be used for projects that serve the Council's priority for e-government as reflected in the goals of the Business Portal Action Plan and the E-Government Strategy. Mr. Schafer will be proposing the use of these monies for special projects such as the development of security handbooks for agencies, and conducting a benchmark study of e-government architecture. The source of funding of the new appropriation is the Information Technology fund.

Commissioner Adams moved to approve the Government Technology Collaboration Fund Grant Guidelines. Commissioner Kuck seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Christensen-Yes, Bryan-Yes, Brown-Yes, Adams-Yes, Maurstad-Yes, Kuck-Yes, and Kosman-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

TECHNICAL PANEL REPORT
Walter Weir, Chair, Technical Panel

The Technical Panel has been meeting monthly. The Work Groups have also been meeting on a regular basis. Some of the issues and meeting agenda items include: further development of the Section 3 of the Statewide Technology Plan; NETCOM, Wireless and NIS Updates; Accessibility Checklist; Video standards; and most recently the Resolution on the Implementation of LB 833.

2001 STATEWIDE TECHNOLOGY PLAN
Michael Winkle, NITC Executive Director and Walter Weir, Chair, Technical Panel

Mr. Weir and Mr. Winkle provided an update on Sections 1-5 of the Statewide Technology Plan. There were no major changes recommended by the Commissioners.

Commissioners had concerns regarding the accomplishments and status of last year's statewide plan, as well as monitoring adherence and compliance to the standards of this year's plan. Commissioners requested that the Councils develop detailed timelines for the Action Items. Staff will provide a report on the progress of last year's statewide plan.

Commissioner Bryan moved to approve the updated Statewide Technology Plan as presented. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Kosman-Yes, Adams-Yes, Kuck-Yes, Brown-Yes, Maurstad-Yes, Bryan-Yes, and Christensen-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

The Commissioners commended staff for their work on the statewide plan.

NEW BUSINESS

Update: Executive Director position. Mr. Winkle is resigning as NITC Executive Director as of June 30, 2001. He will assist with special projects until a replacement is found. Mr. Winkle is developing a job description to assist with the recruitment of the new NITC Executive Director. The Commissioners have two options for filling the position:

- Appoint a subcommittee to Conduct a national search to recruit, interview and hire
- Direct the Lieutenant Governor to look for candidates

The Commissioners agreed by group consensus to have the Lieutenant Governor look for candidates for the position.

NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURNMENT

A meeting date will be determined for early September or late October.

The Lieutenant Governor adjourned the meeting at 2:50 p.m.

Minutes were taken by Lori Lopez Urdiales and reviewed by staff of the Office of the CIO/NITC.

October 23, 2001

To: NITC Commissioners

From: Anne Byers, Community IT Manager

Subject: Community Council Report

Action Item Updates

Updated information on the Community Council's action items are included in the meeting materials.

Community and Rural IT Development

The Community Council has identified community and rural IT development as its highest priority. Accordingly, the bulk of the Council's efforts over the past several months have focused on this area. The Community Council of the NITC and the University of Nebraska's Technologies Across Nebraska initiative have collaborated on the development of the Community Information Technology Toolkit. The toolkit offers a number of resources to help communities become Information Age communities, including a nine-question assessment to help communities determine how well they are utilizing information technology. The toolkit also contains additional resources, success stories, and answers to frequently asked questions.

The toolkit is available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/toolkit or from http://technologiesacrossnebraska.unl.edu/ .

Community Technology Fund

As of this date, the funding for the NITC's Community Technology Fund remains intact. In preparation for the 2001 round of the Community Technology Fund, the guidelines have been revised. Changes were made in the program's funding priorities, award size, method of submission, and disbursement.

Funding Priorities. In past rounds, the goals of the NITC and the priorities of the Community Council served as the funding priorities of the Community Technology Fund. The Community Council has identified the following priorities for the 2002 round:

- Projects which use information technology to address community needs related to community and economic development, the delivery of local government and library services, and health care.
- Projects which use information technology to address community needs in innovative ways or projects in which communities are initiating the use of information technology to address community needs.
- Projects which demonstrate strong collaboration within a community or region in addressing IT development.

Award Size. The size of awards has been limited to $25,000. In previous years, a range of $15,000 to $25,000 was suggested.

Submission of Applications. Applicants are required to submit their applications electronically this year. If an applicant is unable to submit an electronic copy, alternative arrangements can be made. The guidelines also state that if applicants have not received confirmation that their application was received or experience unexpected server problems, a fax copies can be sent as a backup.

Disbursement. In order to provide some additional encouragement for applicants to submit their final reports, we are proposing withholding 10% of the grant award until receipt of a satisfactory final report. Recipients will receive 60% of the grant award in the first and 30% of the award in the second installments.

Dates

Early November, 2001	Release of Guidelines
January 18, 2002	Applicants must notify the NITC of their intent to apply
February 15, 2002	Applications due
April, 2002	Awards announced

Community Council Priorities and Action Plans

Approved by the Community Council on June 1
Updated October 23, 2001

Action Plan: Telehealth Reimbursement and Licensure
Address the issues of telehealth reimbursement and licensure, by providing insurance companies, telehealth providers, and policy makers with information on these issues.
Lead: Telehealth Subcommittee
Time Frame: Completed
Update: The Telehealth Subcommittee has learned that many insurance companies are reimbursing for services provided via telehealth technologies. The situation is expected to improve after October 1 when new Medicare policies take effect which expand reimbursement for services offered via telehealth technologies.

Action Plan: Technical Assistance Center for Telehealth
Explore the feasibility of establishing setting up a Technical Assistance Center for Telehealth. A virtual technical assistance center could provide technical assistance to telehealth providers. The Technical Assistance Center could be a virtual call center or could be Web-based with a bulletin board and best practices. A listserv might also be useful to link telehealth providers in the state.
Lead: Telehealth Subcommittee
Time Frame: Responsibility has been transferred to the Telehealth Development Committee
Update: A separate group, the Telehealth Development Committee, has been formed to pursue funding for telehealth development projects. The Telehealth Subcommittee will focus on policy-related issues surrounding telehealth. The Telehealth Subcommittee will also develop a telehealth section of the Community IT Toolkit by January, 2002.

Action Plan: Telehealth Standards
Make recommendations to the Technical Panel regarding telehealth standards and compatibility issues.
Lead: Telehealth Subcommittee
Time Frame: June, 2001-July, 2002
Update: Michael Beach, the chair the of the Video Standards Work group, spoke to the Telehealth Subcommittee in August.

Action Plan: Rural and Community IT Development
Address the information technology planning needs of Nebraska's communities, by:

- Inventorying and assessing current programs and strategies that address community IT leadership and planning, intellectual infrastructure, and telecommunications infrastructure in communities.

- Identifying specific gaps, duplication and collaborative opportunities regarding information technology needs in communities, including community IT leadership and planning, intellectual infrastructure, and telecommunications infrastructure.

- Making recommendations regarding program development.

- Inventorying community-based IT planning groups in the state.

- Working with the Technologies Across Nebraska initiative to review, make recommendations, and develop Information Technology toolkit resources for communities.

- Conducting a series of meetings with members of community IT committees to review to solicit feedback.

- Making action item and policy recommendations to the Community Council and the NITC.

Lead: Rural and Community IT Development Planning Group
Time frame: May, 2001 – January, 2002
Update: A draft version of the Community IT toolkit was presented at the August 27 Technologies Across Nebraska meeting. Presentations on the toolkit have been given to at the League of Nebraska Municipalities annual meeting, the Nebraska Association of County Officials conference, the Nebraska Rural Institute, and at Nebraska Development network regional group meetings.

The Rural Development Commission has volunteered to conduct the inventory of community-based IT planning groups and anticipates having that information by November 15. The Technologies Across Nebraska Education Subcommittee is inventorying IT programs and classes.

Action Plan: IT Needs of Entreprenuers and Small Businesses
Address the IT needs of entrepreneurs and small businesses by:

- Inventorying and assessing current programs which serve entrepreneurs and small businesses.

- Working with the Technologies Across Nebraska initiative to review, make recommendations, and an IT resource guide for small businesses and entrepreneurs.

Lead: Community Council and Technologies Across Nebraska initiative
Time frame: by January, 2002
Update: This action item will be completed as part of the Rural and Community IT Development action item listed above.

Action Item: Information Technology Clearinghouse
Continue to develop, within the NITC Web site, a clearinghouse service to provide convenient access to information about information technology.
Lead: Community Council, Local Government Subcommittee, Telehealth Subcommittee, and Rural and Community Technology Planning Group
Time Frame: Ongoing
Update: The Community IT Toolkit will be the new community section of the Clearinghouse.

Action Plan: Local Government IT Needs
Address local government IT needs by:

- Reviewing and evaluating information technology policy implications for local governments.

- Identifying and developing toolkit resources for local governments, including sample IT plans, sample inter-local agreements, best practices, and case studies.

- Identifying the implications of LB 827 and developing information resources to help local governments utilize the tools this bill offers communities.

- Developing local government policies and procedures that would
    - Reduce duplication of effort
    - Ensure appropriate compatibility of equipment and software both within a political jurisdiction and between other jurisdictions
    - Establish adequate and meaningful planning, and

- Establish uniform public policies and procedures which promote uniformity, resource sharing, standards and guidelines, support services, training, and cooperative development of geographic information systems.

Lead: Local Government IT Subcommittee
Time Frame: June, 2001-June, 2002
Update: Members of the Local Government Subcommittee met with NIDCAC to discuss this action plan. It was agreed that NIDCAC would focus on the policy issues and the Local Government Subcommittee would focus on developing and identifying toolkit resources. The Local Government section will be developed by January, 2002.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Community Technology Fund 2002
Guidelines

Purpose of the Grant

The Nebraska Information Technology Commission announces the fourth annual round of the Community Technology Fund, a competitive matching grant program. The Community Technology Fund promotes the effective and efficient use of information technology in Nebraska communities. The Community Technology Fund of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission was created by state statute (Section 86-1512).

Dates

Applicants must notify the NITC of their intent to submit an application by 5 p.m. CT Friday, January 18, 2002.

Applications must be received by 5:00 p.m. February 15, 2002.

Awards will be announced in April, 2002, and funds will be disbursed in June, 2002. The grant or performance period will run from June 1, 2002 to May 31, 2003.

Eligibility and Award Information

Funding Availability and Size of Awards

It is anticipated that approximately $200,000 will be available for competitive grants. Awards of up to $25,000 will be made.

Eligible Entities

Only public entities are eligible for Community Technology Fund grants. Public entities are defined as entities that can collect taxes and/or their subdivisions. Examples of public entities include public schools, state colleges, Extension, city and county governments, and county hospitals. Unsatisfactory performance of an applicant under prior Community Technology Fund awards may result in that applicant's proposal not being considered for funding.

Funding Priorities

The Community Technology Fund will be used to further projects which utilize information technology to benefit communities or regions in Nebraska. The following funding priorities for the Community Technology Fund 2002 have been identified by the Community Council and approved by the Nebraska Information Technology Commission:

- Projects which use information technology to address community needs related to community and economic development, the delivery of local government and library services, and health care.
- Projects which use information technology to address community needs in innovative ways or projects in which communities are initiating the use of information technology to address community needs.
- Projects which demonstrate strong collaboration within a community or region in addressing IT development.

Eligible/Ineligible Activities and Costs

Activities which support one or more of the funding priorities of the Community Council are eligible for funding unless otherwise restricted by law or regulation.

Salaries or stipends are eligible if they are necessary for the implementation of the overall project. Equipment costs and transmission costs are eligible if they are necessary for the implementation of the overall project.

Buildings, rents, non-telecommunications utilities, food and beverages, and indirect costs are *ineligible* for grant funds but may be used as the match. Payment of staff or consultants to develop proposals is also a nonallowable cost.

Match Requirement

A match of 20 percent or more of the total project cost is required. The total project cost is the total of the grant award, the match supplied, and any other funding sources.

The match may be a cash match, an in-kind match, or a combination of the two. An in-kind match can include time, people, machines, buildings, rent, and utilities. Project partners must be able to provide their match requirement with currently available resources. Projects which do not meet the required match will not be considered for funding.

Projects which are funded will be required to document both cash and in-kind matches. Acceptable documentation of an in-kind match include:

- Copies of sign-in sheets for volunteers or other records of volunteer hours.

- A signed letter from an employee's supervisor indicating that he/she has contributed a specified number of hours working on the project.
- A signed letter from the appropriate supervisor/director documenting the use of facilities and equipment.

Award Period

Projects must be completed within 12 months of the initial receipt of funds. The performance period will run from June 1, 2002 to May 31, 2003.

Procedures

Assistance in Preparing Applications

In order to facilitate the preparation of Community Technology Fund applications, sample applications, a list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and tips are available on the NITC Web Site (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us). Information on the Community Technology Fund can be accessed directly at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/cc/grants/ .

Submission of Intent to Apply for Funding

All applicants must inform the Nebraska Information Technology Commission of their intent to apply for funding through the Community Technology Fund by Friday, January 18, 2002. Applicants who do not notify the NITC of their intent to apply for funding will not be considered for funding.

This information will be used to facilitate the process of identifying qualified reviewers and to identify potentially duplicative projects. Applicants who submit potentially duplicative projects will be contacted and may be asked to combine their proposals. If potential problems regarding the eligibility of a project are identified, applicants will be notified. It is anticipated that potential problems regarding project eligibility will be identified in only a very small number of submissions.

Applicants should submit the name of the project, sponsoring entity and contact information (including address, phone number, fax number, and e-mail address), a list of project partners, geographic area served, and a brief description of the project. No specific format is required. The required information should be e-mailed to Anne Byers at abyers@notes.state.ne.us. Receipt of an applicant's intent to apply for funding will be confirmed by e-mail. If an applicant is unable to send the required via information via e-mail, the information can be faxed to (402) 471-4608. If an applicant has e-mailed an intent to apply and has not received a confirmation by 4:00 p.m. CT on January 18, a fax copy can be sent to (402) 471-4608 as a backup.

Submission of Applications

Application Form. The application form is available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/cc/grants/ . Applicants may download the form or duplicate it on their own word processor or spreadsheet program. Applicants are asked to submit an electronic copy of the application.

Supporting Documentation. Letters of commitment and letters of support are not required. Information which would otherwise be included in a letter of support or a letter of commitment should be summarized in the application in question 3. Please incorporate other information into the appropriate sections of the application. Copies of quotations from vendors are also not required. Rather than including a print out of a quotation from a vendor for a new computer, include all relevant information in the budget narrative.

Electronic Submission. Applications should be e-mailed to Anne Byers at abyers@notes.state.ne.us as a Word, WordPerfect, Rich Text Format (RTF), HTML or PDF attachment. Budgets can be submitted in any of the formats listed above or as Excel documents. An electronic copy may also be submitted on an IBM-formatted disk if an applicant does not have e-mail. If an applicant is unable to submit an electronic copy, please contact Anne Byers at (402) 471-3805 in advance to make alternate arrangements for submission.

Receipt of applications will be confirmed by e-mail.

Deadline. Applications must be received by 5:00 p.m. CT, February 15, 2002. Receipt of applications will be confirmed via e-mail. If an applicant has e-mailed an application and has not received confirmation by 3:00 p.m. CT on February 15, 2002 or if unexpected server problems occur, a fax copy can be sent to (402) 471-4608 as a backup. Fax backups must be received by 5:00 p.m. CT, February 15, 2002.

A list of applications received will also be available on the Community Technology Fund section of the NITC Web site (http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/cc/grants/).

Application Review Process

The completed application forms will be reviewed by Nebraska Information Technology Commission staff for compliance with minimum eligibility requirements. Ineligible applications will be returned to the applicant with an explanation and recommendation for improving the document.

As part of the technical review, the Technical Panel will approve Community Technology Fund reviewers. Reviewers will include members of the Community Council, Technical Panel and/or their designees, and NITC staff. Other professionals working in the fields of community development and information technology may also serve as committee members.

Eligible applications will be reviewed using the evaluation criteria listed below.

Evaluation Criteria	**Maximum Score**
Goals, Activities and Outcomes	20 points
Project Justification	15 points
Technical Impact	15 points
Implementation Plan	30 points
Budget	20 points
Total	**100 points**

The maximum number of points which may be awarded for each question and the scoring for the budget section is indicated on the application form.

The Community Council will make recommendations regarding project funding to the Nebraska Information Technology Commission.

A summary of the project evaluations, the technical review conducted by the Technical Panel, and any recommendations of the Community Council will be presented to the Nebraska Information Technology Commission. The Nebraska Information Technology Commission will make the final decision regarding project funding.

Contractual Agreement

Grant recipients are required to enter into a contractual agreement with the Nebraska Information Technology Commission.

Drug Free Work Place Policy

Recipients are also required to submit a copy of their Drug Free Work Place Policy.

Disbursement of Funds

Funds will be disbursed in three installments. Recipients will receive 60% of the grant award in the first and 30% of the award in the second installments. Recipients will receive 10% of the grant award in the third and final installment. The first installment will be disbursed approximately two weeks after the receipt of a signed contract. The second installment will be disbursed approximately two weeks after the receipt of a satisfactory six month progress report, including a current and complete accounting. The final installment will be disbursed after the receipt of a satisfactory final report, including a current and complete accounting. Target dates are listed below:

First Payment	60% of grant award	June 2002
Second Payment	30% of grant award	December 2002
Final Payment	10% of grant award	June 2003

The second and final disbursements will be made only upon receipt of documentation of satisfactory performance of the agreement and a current and complete accounting. The payment of the second and final disbursements may be accelerated with documentation of more rapid progress. If, at the time the second or final disbursement is scheduled to be made, the project has not expended a sizable portion of previous installments, the payment schedule and/or amount of the second installment may be renegotiated.

Reporting Requirements

Grant recipients will be required to submit a progress report every six months until the project is completed. It is the expectation of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission that no project will require more than 12 months to complete.

The first progress report, including a complete and current accounting, will be due December 1, 2002.

A full report, detailing the results of the project and including a complete and current accounting, will be required by June 1, 2003. This accounting should include receipts or invoices of all expenditures made with grant funds and documentation of cash and in-kind matches. A copy of materials created from this project should also be submitted. This information will be publicized across the state so that everyone can benefit from the work supported by Community Technology Grant funds.

Amendments to the Agreement

Requests to amend the agreement must be received in writing by the Nebraska Information Technology Commission. Requests which substantially change the scope of the project will be brought before the Community Council for approval.

Right to Audit

The NITC reserves the right to audit any and all grant projects for a period of 2 years after project completion.

For More Information

For further information, please contact:

Anne Byers, Community Technology Manager
Nebraska Information Technology Commission
521 So. 14th Street, Suite 200
Lincoln, NE 68508-2707
phone (402) 471-3805
e-mail: abyers@notes.state.ne.us

Education Council of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Recommendation for Action Items, 2001-2002

EC Priorities

The sector priorities of the Education Council of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission are to provide recommendations that support:

PRIORITY EC-1: Providing an infrastructure that will permit all citizens of Nebraska to have access to the same educational experiences, regardless of location.

EC 1.1

TITLE: **Statewide Video Standard**

DESCRIPTION: The Education Council will assist in developing and implementing the statewide video standard for distance learning including a migration path and cost analysis. A coordinated, planned deployment of technology investment across the State's distance learning systems is needed to address interactive distance learning and new technology solutions.

LEAD: Operations Work Group or Appointed Task Group

TIMEFRAME: 4th Quarter, 2001-3rd Quarter, 2002

UPDATE: The Education Council has named four members to the Technical Panel's Video Standards Work Group. As soon as the video standard and migration plan is approved by the NITC, a report will be developed detailing the costs, benefits, and impediments to developing a single, statewide distance learning system.

EC 1.2

TITLE: **Adequate Rural Bandwidth**

DESCRIPTION: The Education Council will support strategies that ensure that adequate bandwidth is being provided to the rural areas of the State so as to provide access to the same educational experiences, regardless of location. The Education Council will emphasize the needs of the rural areas, including IP-centric applications, during NETCOM transport deployment and investigate application development that supports synchronous, asynchronous distance education as well as voice/video/data transfer.

LEAD: Policies, Procedures, Planning Subcommittee or Appointed Task Group

TIMEFRAME: 4th Quarter, 2001-2nd Quarter, 200*2*

UPDATE: As the NETCOM Contract nears implementation; the Staff of the NITC and the Task Group will investigate the cost, benefits and impediments to deploying Internet 2 for K-12 districts and remaining higher education institutions in Nebraska.

PRIORITY EC-3: Ensuring life cycle funding;

EC 3.1

TITLE: **Statewide educational technology appropriation**

DESCRIPTION: The Education Council will pursue a statewide appropriation for building future educational potential and subsidizing core infrastructure needs. As K-12 and Higher Education have continued to invest in educational telecommunications for basic systems processes and educational outreach, technology costs have continued to grow. The amount of funding needed exceeds the amount that can be reallocated through existing appropriations. As institutions reach the saturation point for administrative and student computing, lease-purchase options would help stabilize funding needs.

LEAD: Policies, Procedures, Planning Subcommittee or Appointed Task Group

TIMEFRAME: 4th Quarter, 2001--1st Quarter, 2002

UPDATE: The Midwest Higher Education Consortium, in cooperation with the Education Council, has negotiated and advertised a bulk computer purchasing agreement with at least three primary vendors. The discounts are available to higher education institutions, K-12 districts, state government, students, and staff. Assistance is needed to advertise the agreement to all affected entities as well as explore innovative approaches to long-term information technology funding.

PRIORITY EC-4: Addressing the needs of the learner;

EC 4.1

TITLE: **Role of Technology in Standards**

DESCRIPTION: The Education Council will recommend the appropriate role for technology in statewide academic standards and/or proficiencies and the part it plays in certification/re-certification. Twenty-six of 50 states are reported to have certification and/or re-certification requirements in instructional technology. Nebraska has chosen to recognize technology skills for teachers as proficiencies and are not required for certification or for most appraisals making skill development quite voluntary and unmeasured.

LEAD: Training Advisory Work Group or Appointed Task Group

TIMEFRAME: 3rd Quarter, 2001 – ongoing

UPDATE: Task Group will be assigned in September, 2001 and will begin background research on information technology requirements in teacher certification and appraisal.

PRIORITY EC-6: Pursuing leading edge technology applications.

EC 6.1

TITLE: **Synchronous and Asynchronous Instructional Methods**

DESCRIPTION: The Education Council will encourage the development of new instructional methods and resources for synchronous and asynchronous instruction. Both K-12 and Higher Education are going through a period of rapid development and creation of new learning opportunities using interactive and web-based courses. By encouraging funds for workshops and promoting training opportunities, the Council will enhance the quality of distance education offered in the State.

LEAD: Training Advisory Work Group or Appointed Task Group

TIMEFRAME: 3rd Quarter, 2001 – ongoing

UPDATE: The Training Advisory Work Group recommended awarding of $120,000 in Telecommunications Training Grants in April, 2001. In addition, its July retreat focused on performing an assessment of training needs within the State. Other groups such as the Nebraska Distance Learning Association and Task Force IV of the Nebraska Catalyst Grant are working on related activities.

PRIORITY EC-2: Identifying and facilitating diverse training opportunities;

No action item was identified for this priority in this performance year.

PRIORITY EC-5: Coordinating statewide education I.T. efforts and resources, including collaboration with public and private entities;

No action item was identified for this priority in this performance year.

The current slate of action items recommended by the Education Council on May 16, 2001 were approved by the NITC on June 13, 2001 as Section 5--Implementation of the Statewide Technology Plan.

Distance Education Network Completion Grant
Project Timeline as of 10/15/01

LB 833 signed by the Governor	05/21/01
NDE meeting with distance education consortium directors	06/28/01
Distance education survey responses due	06/29/01
Stakeholder meeting #1	07/13/01
Stakeholder meeting #2	08/21/01
Hearing draft of Rule 89 (containing DENC regulations) approved by State Board	09/07/01
Intent to apply responses due	10/05/01
NDE progress report to NITC Technical Panel	10/09/01
Rule 89 hearing	10/12/01
DENC grant application sent to eligible school districts	10/15/01
*File E-rate Form 470 at least 28 days prior to joining a consortium	Prior to DENC grant submission
Anticipated State Board approval of Rule 89 revisions	11/02/01
DENC grant application deadline	12/14/01
Consideration of the DENC consortium application by the NITC Technical Panel	01/08/02
Tentative DENC grant award	01/15/02
E-rate Form 471 filing window	Not Yet Announced (Usually mid-November through January)
Schools schedule classes for Fall 2002	Jan. – Feb '02
RFP(s) released	01/15/02
Bids – RFP responses due	03/01/02
Vendor(s) selected	03/15/02
Vendor(s) order equipment	04/01/02
First installation period	Summer '02
Second installation period	Summer '03
Third installation period	Summer '04

* E-rate Form 470 must be filed 28 days before (1) joining a consortium, and (2) filing E-rate Form 471.

ESTIMATED DENC GRANT BENEFITS
As Of 10/11/01

	Estimated Maximum Cost Per High School Site		65 High School Sites ①	48 High School Sites ②
Classroom Equipment	$30,500		$1,982,500	$1,464,000
Equipment Installation	4,000		260,000	192,000
One-time Connection Charges	2,000		130,000	96,000
	65 sites 9,654	48 sites 26,000 ③	627,500	1,248,000
	$46,154	$62,500	$3,000,000	$3,000,000

①According to the latest data available, 50 public school districts with 65 high school sites do not yet have distance education capacity and could potentially apply for grant benefits.

②Based on Intent to Apply responses, 41 school districts with a total of 48 high school sites indicated their intent to apply for grant benefits. As the Intent to Apply responses are not binding, the actual number of school districts/sites that apply may vary. Therefore, final grant benefits per school site may vary from the amounts listed above. Please note that grant benefits will be based on functionality of the distance education capacity installed rather than the dollar value of the goods or services provided through the grant. In other words, each school site may not receive the identical financial benefit.

③The one-time connection charges reflect the total pool of funds available divided by the number of sites. The actual amount allowed for one-time connection charges per high school site may vary in order to achieve line lease charges that are comparable to the consortium joined, or in the case of a new consortium, to the statewide average of consortium line lease charges.

NAME	INTENT TO APPLY	# BLDGS
ADAMS CENTRAL JR-SR HIGH SCHOOL	Yes	1
ALLIANCE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
BAYARD PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
BENNINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
CHAPPELL PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
CLAY CENTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
CROFTON COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Yes	1
DAVID CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
DONIPHAN-TRUMBULL PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
EAST BUTLER PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
EMERSON-HUBBARD PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
FALLS CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
GILTNER PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
GRAND ISLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
HARVARD PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
HASTINGS PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
HIGH PLAINS COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Yes	1
HOMER COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Yes	1
HUMPHREY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
KENESAW PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
LAKEVIEW COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Yes	1
LEXINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
LEYTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
LINCOLN PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	6
LITCHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
LODGEPOLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
MADISON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
MC COOL JUNCTION PUB SCHOOLS	Yes	1
OSCEOLA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
POLK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT #15	Yes	1
POTTER-DIX PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
RISING CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
SCHUYLER CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL	Yes	1
SHELBY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
SIDNEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
SO. CENTRAL NE UNIFIED SYSTEM 5	Yes	3
SOUTH SARPY DIST 46	Yes	1
ST PAUL PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
WATERLOO PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
WYNOT PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Yes	1
Total H.S. Buildings Intending to Apply		**48**
AUBURN PUBLIC SCHOOLS	No	1
BELLEVUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	No	2
FORT CALHOUN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	No	1
G.I. NORTHWEST HIGH SCHOOL	No (emailed)	1
OMAHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	No	7
PAPILLION-LA VISTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	No	2
PONCA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	No (verbal)	1
SOUTH PLATTE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	No	1
WOOD RIVER RURAL HIGH SCHOOL	No	1
Total H.S. Buildings NOT Participating		**17**

Recommendations for Telecommunications Funding

By the Training Advisory Committee
May 3, 2001

Round 9 Telecommunications Trainng Proposals

Project/Applicant/Funding	Project Description
Medicine Valley Web-Based/ Multimedia Training Project Medicine Valley Public Schools Curtis, NE *(Jerrod Burke, Technology Coordinator)* TRAINING FUNDS **$ 10,000.00** Inkind 3,395.00 Total $ 13,395.00	*This grant seeks to familiarize the Medicine Valley Public Schools' faculty and administration on how to effectively use the Internet and technology throughout their classrooms. Teachers and administrators will design web pages, train on using multimedia software, and practice integrating these new skills into their currently utilized curriculum. The goal is not to add to the curriculum, but to enhance it through telecommunications.*
Learning Together for Our Future York Public Schools York, NE *(Bonnie Moses, York Public Schools)* TRAINING FUNDS $ **9,985.00** Inkind 6,484.75 Total $ 16,469.75	*The main goals for this grant are to expose teachers to the skills necessary for utilization of Internet in the classroom, to provide strategies for designing curriculum projects which use telecommunications, to equip teaches with the assessment and technology skills to design classroom projects, to provide on-going support to implement projects, to equip teachers with the technology competencies needed, and to provide an avenue for sharing this work with other teachers.*
Rx: ProD Educational Service Unit #4 Nebraska City, NE *(Linda Engel, Coordinator of Instructional Technology))* TRAINING FUNDS $ **10,000.00** Inkind 3,350.00 Total $ 13,350.00	*ESU #4, in collaboration with Nebraska City Public Schools, is going to provide professional development that will enhance standards-based science education through the application of web-based presentations and training supported by collaborative use of distance learning and telecommunications. Training will include learning how to put PowerPoint presentations on the web, how to edit HTML and adding video clips and hyperlinks to PowerPoint, as well as training on science standards and improving science instruction.*

Just in Time Learning

Educational Service Unit #6
Milford, NE

(Sandy Blankenship, Professional Development Consultant)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**9,994.52**
Inkind		9,992.00
Total	$	19,986.52

Just in time learning is defined as learning where information and conceptual materials are accessed only when needed. The activities in the grant will teach how the Internet can be a learning tool for teachers and students, achieving curriculum objectives . It will enhance the use of technology resources including the distance learning classroom plus give the teachers the skills and support to establish a "just in time" environment in their classrooms. Participating teachers will at the same time see how their curriculum projects address the Nebraska standards.

Crossroads Distance Learning Education Consortium Project (2)

Educational Service Unit #7
Columbus, NE

(Phyllis Brunken, Media Director and Distance Learning Coordinator)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**10,000.00**
Inkind		18,066.80
Total	$	28,066.80

This proposal seeks to train teachers in the newly formed Crossroads Distance Learning Education Consortium (CDLEC). The goals are: to identify staff that will be candidates to teach over the distance learning system, to provide techniques of proper delivery of information, to develop curriculum planning and instruction, and to provide techniques of classroom management. This is a continuation of a grant from last year, with this year's grant seeking to provide training for intermediate and advanced teachers.

eTeacher: The Technology-Competent Standards-Based Educator

Educational Service Unit #10
Kearney, NE

(Gracia Gillming, ESU #10)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**9,225.00**
Inkind		3,100.00
Total	$	12,325.00

ESU #10 seeks to provide training, time, and assistance for twelve participating teachers as they align their curriculum with the Nebraska standards and integrate technology as a tool to accomplish this. There will be three teachers representing each of the four core areas of curriculum. A web site will be created that showcases the completed lesson plans. The twelve teachers will then take their new skills back to their schools to train colleagues.

Online Learning Opportunities Across Nebraska

Educational Service Unit #16
Ogallala, NE

(Melissa Engel, Telecomputing Coordinator)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**10,000.00**
Inkind		5,550.94
Total	$	15,550.94

This is a collaboration between five ESUs: ESU #18 in Lincoln, ESU #4 in Auburn, ESU #7 in Columbus, ESU #10 in Kearney, and ESU # 13 in Scottsbluff. These ESUs will create five online courses which will be offered to teachers statewide on a variety of technology staff development topics, including Information Literacy, Internet in the Classroom, WebQuests, Multimedia such as HyperStudio on the World Wide Web, Networking Fundamentals, and Transitioning to an Online Course.

Nebraska Summit on Distance Learning – Year 2

Central Community College
Grand Island, NE

(Dr. Sarah Cunningham, Instructional Technology and Advancement Director)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**10,000.00**
Inkind		5,000.00
Total	$	15,000.00

This grant seeks to fund training activities in the field of distance learning by bringing together professionals in distance learning to share knowledge and expertise for the benefit of Nebraska's K-12 and post secondary education, health care, business and industry, military and government organizations. This conference will provide training opportunities in effective teaching, instructional design, student support issues, web based learning, and technical issues.

Re-Designing Your Course for the Internet

Central Community College
Grand Island, NE

(Dr. Sarah Cunningham, Instructional Technology and Advancement Director)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**9,980.00**
Inkind		11,246.00
Total	$	21,226.00

Faculty from Central Community College and Wayne State College will be trained on how to redesign a lecture course to a web-based course. The project seeks to do this by increasing the knowledge base of faculty on the similarities and differences of teaching via the Internet and a live classroom, training the faculty how to redesign their courses, and providing on-going support to faculty design teams during the actual redesign phase. The teams will consist of faculty members and instructional design personnel.

A Model for Predicting the Successful Completion of an Online Course

Metropolitan Community College
Omaha, NE

(H. Lynn Bradman, Social Sciences faculty, John McAdam Dir. of Technology Enhanced Learning)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**6,870.00**
Inkind		5,129.00
Total	$	11,999.00

This project will identify the variables which contribute to student success in an online course and make the information available to online faculty and course designers through an ancillary online course or series of web-based instructional resources. Faculty and course designers can then use this information to further develop and enhance existing course components, aid in the development and success of new courses, increase student retention, and enhance student satisfaction.

Development of Sample Online Course

Southeast Community College
Beatrice, NE

(Sue Fielder, Instructor, Engish)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**9,992.00**
Inkind		4,275.00
Total	$	14,267.00

This project will develop and test an Interactive Tutorial and Sample Online Course for use by faculty interested in teaching online. The tutorial and course will replace the current Lotus Notes mini-course, which doesn't allow faculty the viewpoint of the student as students use web-browsers for their courses. The tutorial will be on a CD-ROM. The sample online course will require faculty to experience a course via the web, with the need to open attached files, view photos, open audio files, and complete forms.

Using Asynchronous Learning Networks

Chadron State College
Chadron, NE

(Dr. George W. H. Smith, III, Instructional Design Coordinator)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**6,680.00**
Inkind		11,700.00
Total	$	18,380.00

Chadron State will conduct a two-day workshop to teach faculty the skills to use technology to design and develop writing intensive courses through the use of Computer Mediated Communication in Asynchronous Learning Networks. The workshop will provide methodologies for designing and developing online assessment instruments that foster student critical and analytical thinking.

Training Secondary Teachers in Online Course Technology

Peru State College
Peru, NE

(Andrew Elkins, Dean of Arts and Sciences)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**9,987.50**
Inkind		3,200.00
Total	$	13,187.50

Peru State College seeks to train high school teachers to use Blackboard software. Peru will be using Blackboard software in it's Early Entry Internet program, in which high school students have the opportunity to earn college credit during their junior and senior years. A trainer provided by Peru State College will visit area schools during the summer to train secondary teachers in groups of five. The training will be a four-hour session. The trainer will then be available to answer questions via email. The project seeks to train 50 teachers.

Teaching for Effective Learning in the Distance Classroom

University of Nebraska - Kearney
Kearney, NE

(Dr. Barbara Audley, Dean of Continuing Education)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**10,000.00**
Inkind		16,150.00
Total	$	26,150.00

This project intends to develop a cadre of leadership teachers in the Tri-Valley Distance Learning Consortium schools who will provide on-site mentoring to their colleagues in an expanded array of presentation skills for effective use of the distance learning technology available in their schools. Teachers participating in the project will learn about instructional delivery by multiple methods, such as panel discussions, targeted viewing, games, role playing, demonstrations, and peer teaching.

How are Nebraska Institutions of Higher Education Responding to Student Needs: Telecommunications and Technology as Vehicles for Distance and/or Extended Ed.

University of Nebraska - Lincoln
Lincoln, NE

(Dr. Sheldon Stick, Dr. Donald Uerling)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**5,000.00**
Inkind		15,300.00
Total	$	20,300.00

This proposal focuses on the availability of education to students and potential students. It seeks to learn the extent Nebraska higher education employs telecommunications and other forms of technology as an adjunct to conventional (on campus) courses. Each of the 35 higher education institutions will be contacted to learn how they are using telecommunications and technology to enable students to further their educational development.

Building Distance Learning Awareness and Efficacy Among Nebraska Pre-Service Students

University of Nebraska – Lincoln, Teachers College
Lincoln, NE

(Matt Kutscher, Instructional Tech. Specialist
Dan Schmit, Instructional Tech. Specialist
Lori Meyers, Instructional Tech. Assistant)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**8,613.24**
Inkind		2,570.00
Total	$	11,183.24

This project targets pre-service methods students in subject areas identified in an NDE survey as the most frequently delivered distance learning K-12 subject areas and will include participants from UNL, Nebraska Wesleyan, and Union College. The identified subject areas include foreign language, mathematics, language arts, and business. Students will be trained on current usage and best practice, managing distance learning technology, and the development of instructional activities. The project activities are designed to promote awareness, experiences, and efficacy for teaching in the distance learning environment.

Technology Training for the Norfolk Public Schools: A Collaborative Project of the Lifelong Learning Center Partners

University of Nebraska Northeast Research and Extension Center
Norfolk, NE

(Vicky Jones, NU Extended Education Coordinator)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**10,000.00**
Inkind		32,730.00
Total	$	42,730.00

The educational partners of the Lifelong Learning Center in Norfolk – University of Nebraska, Northeast Community College, and Wayne State College – will collaboratively assist the Norfolk Public School system in upgrading the technological skills of its teachers. The project plans to train 110 teachers on introductory technology training from UN Cooperative Extension and 32 teachers in a software package applicable to their classroom needs from Wayne State College and/or Northeast Community College. In addition, 15 teachers will enroll in a graduate level course on integrating technology into their classroom from either Wayne State College or UNL.

An Online WebShop to Support the Integration of Space Activities

University of Nebraska - Omaha
Omaha, NE

(Neal Grandgenett, Professor
Neal Topp, Associate Professor)

TRAINING FUNDS	$	**9,640.00**
Inkind		4,820.00
Total	$	14,460.00

A growing interest in the UNO Space Shuttle Simulation Laboratory has created a need to train teachers to use the blend of NASA and Nebraska activities. This project will develop an online teacher training webshop to supplement the current in-person training sessions which are now inadequate to meet the number of teachers wishing to be trained.

Additional Initiatives Approved

NEB*SAT Technical Training Workshop
$3,000

This workshop will cover issues relevant to technicians in both K-12 and Higher Education settings and provide an opportunity for institutions new to distance learning to interact with those who can serve as mentors.

Funding Totals

Round 9 Totals

	K-12	ESU	Community Coll.	State College	University	Additional	Total
Training Funds	$19,985.00	$49,219.52	$36,842.00	$16,667.50	$43,253.24	$3,000.00	**$168,967.26**
In Kind/Match	$19,879.75	$40,059.74	$25,650.00	$14,900.00	$71,570.00	$0.00	$172,059.49
Total	**$39,864.75**	**$89,279.26**	**$62,492.00**	**$31,567.50**	**$114,823.24**	**$3,000.00**	**$341,026.75**

State Government Council
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

SGC Action Items
(Revised: 2 OCT 2001)

PRIORITY SGC-1: Implementing electronic government (e-government) to provide for a cost effective, efficient delivery of services while maintaining necessary security and confidentiality of non-public information.

SGC 1.1
TITLE: **E-Government to Business Initiative**
DESCRIPTION: The NITC adopted the e-government strategic plan in November 2000. Governor Johanns endorsed the strategic plan and directed that an initial focus be placed on the interaction between government and businesses. The Business Portal Action Plan was developed to guide that effort. This action item will involve the continued implementation of that plan. (A copy is available at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/sgc/ and includes a complete list of short and long term action items.)
LEAD: Business Portal Work Group
TIMEFRAME: Short-term action items - 3rd Quarter 2001
Long-term action items - 2nd Quarter 2003
UPDATE: NOL has developed a test version of the Business Portal for the state's Web site. Work is being done to incorporate the database of business forms. NOL has posted a survey for input from users and will be conducting facilitated meetings with business representatives. On schedule for announcement of Portal going live in December 2001.

SGC 1.2
TITLE: **E-Government to Citizens Initiative**
DESCRIPTION: Building on the business initiative, develop and implement an action plan to provide electronic services to citizen.
LEAD: Work Group to be formed
TIMEFRAME: Beginning 2nd Quarter 2002

PRIORITY SGC-2: Improving collaboration, both between agencies and with other stakeholders, in all areas of IT

SGC 2.1
TITLE: **Develop technical standards, guidelines, and best practices**
DESCRIPTION: The SGC will prepare standards, guidelines, and best practices for a technical architecture for state government. The SGC will work with the Technical Panel to develop these standards and guidelines.
LEAD: SGC work group to be created.
TIMEFRAME: 3rd Quarter 2001 - 4th Quarter 2002 (ongoing)
UPDATE: Technical standards and guidelines for the following are currently under review: Accessibility; Hardware; Security and Video.

SGC 2.2
TITLE: **Funding for enterprise projects and infrastructure**
DESCRIPTION: Review and make recommendation on funding for enterprise projects and infrastructure development.
LEAD: Chief Information Officer
TIMEFRAME: Ongoing

SGC 2.3
TITLE: **Directory Services and E-mail**
DESCRIPTION: These service areas both have important enterprise impacts for state government. Work should continue to improve collaboration among agencies on these to ensure efficient and effective utilization of these services. The SGC will continue to develop and recommend technical standards and/or guidelines for state government directory services and e-mail.
LEAD: Directory Services Work Group and E-mail Work Group / Rick Becker
TIMEFRAME:

- Directory Services:
  Short-term Action: Windows 2000 Active Directory - 2nd Quarter 2001.
  Long-term Action: Issues relating to an enterprise directory - 4th Quarter 2001
- E-mail:
  Review standards: 4th Quarter 2001

UPDATE: Directory Services short-term action item has been completed. The Microsoft Active Directory root for state government is up and running. Agencies will be added to directory over the coming months. Long-term issues relating to an enterprise directory for state government are being reviewed by IMServices with assistance from IBM Global Services.

SGC 2.4
TITLE: **IT Training**
DESCRIPTION: The SGC will continue to identify and pursue opportunities for IT related training for state government IT professionals and users. One area of focus should be on project management training.
LEAD: Work group to be formed
TIMEFRAME: To be determined

SGC 2.5
TITLE: **Technical Forums**
DESCRIPTION: The SGC should continue to support the sharing of information among agencies through technical forums and workshops.
LEAD: To be determined
TIMEFRAME: To be determined

PRIORITY SGC-3: Providing a planning and implementation process for IT projects which avoids unnecessary delay and bureaucracy.

SGC 3.1
TITLE: **Improved Planning Process**
DESCRIPTION: Continue to improve the information technology planning process for state agencies. The SGC will review, and revise as appropriate, the planning documents utilized by agencies, including: agency comprehensive information technology plans and agency project proposal forms for budget request.
LEAD: Office of the CIO
TIMEFRAME: 3rd Quarter 2001
UPDATE: Revisions to the following documents have been completed: Agency Comprehensive Information Technology Plan form; Project Proposal Form for budget requests; and Guidance Document for Agency Budget Requests.

SGC 3.2
TITLE: **Improved Project Management**
DESCRIPTION: The SGC will continue to provide guidance to agencies on best practices for project management. Areas of focus should include: management of IT

related projects; measuring results; preparing project closure reports; and recommendations for a certification process for project managers.
LEAD: Chief Information Officer
TIMEFRAME: 4th Quarter 2001

SGC 3.3
TITLE: **Evaluation of Future Technology Issues**
DESCRIPTION: The SGC will develop best practices in IT planning for agencies with respect to evaluating existing IT systems, including the costs and risks. The SGC will also examine ways to better review and analyze issues related to emerging technologies.
LEAD: Chief Information Officer
TIMEFRAME: Ongoing

PRIORITY SGC-4: Implementing appropriate policies for information technology related security and privacy.

SGC 4.1
TITLE: **Security Policies**
DESCRIPTION: In January 2001, the NITC adopted the security policies developed by the Technical Panel's Security Architecture Work Group. These policies, guidelines, and best practices are intended to provide a framework for a secure computing environment, with a focus on state government. The SGC, in coordination with the Technical Panel, will work to implement these policies in state government.
LEAD: To be determined
TIMEFRAME: To be determined
UPDATE: Security handbook templates have been created for state agencies. Separate documents have been created for each of the following: Users; Technical Staff; and Security Officers.

SGC 4.2
TITLE: **Privacy Policies**
DESCRIPTION: Develop information technology related privacy standards, guidelines, and best practices for state government. This action item to include federal HIPAA requirements.
LEAD: To be determined
TIMEFRAME: To be determined

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Government Technology Collaboration Fund – 2001

October 31, 2001

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

	Score	#	Agency	Project Title	GTCF Request	Total Cost	SGC Recommedation
1	96	2001-03	Office of the CIO	E-Government Architecture Study	$ 50,000.00	$ 80,000.00	$ -
2	93	2001-06	Dept. of Natural Resources (Multiple Agencies)	Creating a Common Framework for Integrating Surface Water Data	$ 25,000.00	$ 56,200.00	$ 25,000.00
3	91	2001-04	Office of the CIO	HIPAA Assessment and Strategy for State Government	$ 30,000.00	$ 40,000.00	$ -
4	88	2001-20	Library Commission	Value-Added Book Reviews: Any Time, Any Place	$ 8,322.00	$ 11,096.00	$ 8,322.00
5	88	2001-05	Office of the CIO	Security Assessment	$ 46,800.00	$ 62,500.00	$ 46,800.00
6	87	2001-09	IMServices	Enterprise Security Awareness Training	$ 36,620.00	$ 93,620.00	$ 36,620.00
7	87	2001-08*	IMServices	Enterprise E-Government Security Software	$ 151,000.00	$ 415,000.00	$ -
8	86	2001-07	IMServices (Multiple Agencies)	Information Technology Support Tools Project	$ 105,000.00	$ 142,000.00	$ 74,000.00
9	86	2001-11	IMServices and Workers' Compensation Court	Enterprise Content Management Study	$ 100,000.00	$ 135,000.00	$ 100,000.00
10	84	2001-01	Assistive Technology Partnership	Workforce Investment Act Resource Centers	$ 25,000.00	$ 112,910.00	$ 25,000.00
11	83	2001-19	Dept. of Agriculture (Multiple Agencies)	Fee Collection Program	$ 9,900.00	$ 13,200.00	$ -
12	83	2001-14	State Patrol	Mobile Data Computer (MDC) Project and Remote Terminal Server (RTS) Project	$ 53,227.00	$ 153,227.00	$ 31,070.25
13	81	2001-02	State Fire Marshal	All-Incident Reporting System	$ 69,956.00	$ 99,922.00	$ -
14	80	2001-15	Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired	Accessible E-Government	$ 26,900.00	$ 37,387.00	$ -
15	80	2001-16	HHSS (Multiple Agencies)	Employee Training Record System	$ 15,000.00	$ 20,000.00	$ -
16	80	2001-12	IMServices (Multiple Agencies)	Automated Legislative Bill Tracking	$ 20,000.00	$ 26,700.00	$ -
17	79	2001-13	Nebraska Arts Council	Continuation of E-Granting Conversion Project	$ 40,000.00	$ 54,000.00	$ -
18	79	2001-21	Board of Parole	Criminal History Integration into Corrections Tracking System (CTS)	$ 12,000.00	$ 16,000.00	$ -
19	74	2001-17	UNL - Conservation and Survey Division	Creating Digital Access and Archiving of the Conservation and Survey Division Aerial Photography Collection	$ 57,200.00	$ 129,800.00	$ -
20	68	2001-18	Commission on the Status of Women	Grant Proposal	$ 5,512.50	$ 7,350.00	$ -
21	60	2001-10	IMServices (Multiple Agencies)	Lotus Notes Interagency Collaboration Education Project	$ 1,000.00	$ 1,935.00	$ -
				TOTALS	$ 888,437.50	$ 1,707,847.00	**$ 346,812.25**
						AVAILABLE	**$ 347,920.00**
						UNOBLIGATED	**$ 1,107.75**

*Costs listed are for Phase I. Total cost of project is $2,483,000 with grant funds requested of $1,400,000.

State Government Council
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Recommendation to the NITC
Government Technology Collaboration Fund – 2001

The State Government Council, at their meeting on October 11, 2001, reviewed the 21 applications for funding from the Government Technology Collaboration Fund and recommended that the following projects be funded:

Request #2001-01 **$25,000.00**
Agency: Assistive Technology Partnership
Project: Workforce Investment Act Resource Centers

- Integrates Assistive technology solutions into the Workforce Development One Stop Resource Centers to increase awareness of the potential of Assistive technology to enhance the employability and productivity of persons with disabilities in competitive employment.

Request #2001-05 **$46,800.00**
Agency: Office of the CIO
Project: Security Assessment

- The purpose of this grant is to engage a qualified firm to conduct a security audit and security testing of the state's information technology infrastructure.

Request #2001-06 **$25,000.00**
Agency: Department of Natural Resources
Project: Creating a Common Framework for Integrating Surface Water Data

- This project is part of a larger collaborative effort to develop a standardized, statewide, surface water features database (map), to facilitate the collection and integration of data and public policies of multiple state, local, and federal agencies that make or implement public policies related to Nebraska's surface water. Specifically, this project will develop a digital, (1:24,000-scale) geospatial database (map), with associated attributes, for the surface water features in the Lower Elkhorn Watershed in eastern Nebraska.

Request #2001-07 **$74,000.00**
Agency: IMServices
Project: Information Technology Support Tools Project

- The project to implement an IT Support Tools System is a joint project with the Department of Correctional Services, the Department of Labor's Workforce Development group, Health and Human Services System, Workers' Compensation Court, and DAS Information Management Services. These agencies are working together to replace and upgrade aging technical support software. The project also provides some of the agencies with new, needed software function. The system will include problem management (help desk), hardware/software management (technology assets tracking), change management, and knowledge bases.

STAFF COMMENT:
After consulting with the applicant, the State Government Council recommended funding this project at $74,000 rather than the requested amount of $105,000.

Request #2001-09 **$36,620.00**

Agency: IMServices

Project: Enterprise Security Awareness Training

- This project will provide security training to security officers, IT staff, and other employees of state agencies.

Request #2001-11 **$100,000.00**

Agency: IMServices and Workers' Compensation Court

Project: Enterprise Content Management Study

- The Enterprise Content Management Project is a two-phase undertaking to address the methodology of systematically organizing the State's electronic information resources so that the resources can be managed, secured, and made available as required. Conceptually, the need for enterprise content management combines interagency business knowledge, policies, information content, work processes, and technology with an overlying architecture that can deliver the content via a flexible, adaptive, portal-based service accessed with a single sign-on.

Request #2001-14 **$31,070.25**

Agency: State Patrol

Project: Mobile Data Computer (MDC) Project and Remote Terminal Server (RTS) Project

- The first project is referred to as the MDC (Mobile Data Computer) Project. The objective of the MDC Project is to increase the amount of information provided to four (4) Headquarters Troop traffic officers by installing mobile data computers and 800 MHz radios in their marked patrol vehicles. The MDCs will have connectivity to the City of Lincoln's 800 MHz trunked radio system which allows them wireless, high speed connectivity to the Nebraska State Patrol Switcher. The Switcher is the device that allows access to all Federal and state databases. The project will provide the officers with the tools necessary to access these law enforcement data systems directly. Currently, officers often wait in que for dispatcher response. The goal of this project is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of four Nebraska State Patrol troopers. This directive will enhance a pilot project consisting of one officer utilizing the MDC system in cooperation with the City of Lincoln. This project will require the purchase of laptops, computers, wireless network infrastructure hardware, software and licensing. The City of Lincoln is providing the 800 Mhz radios to the Nebraska State Patrol.

STAFF COMMENT:

The State Government Council recommended funding only the MDC project and not the RTS project. The recommended award of $31,070.25 represents the cost of the MDC project, less the required 25% match.

Request #2001-20 **$8,322.00**

Library Commission

Value-Added Book Reviews: Any Time, Any Place

- Provide book reviews on the Web, including oral reviews of books for children and young adults.

TOTAL **$346,812.25**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-01

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
Assistive Technology Partnership (Comm. for the Blind and Visually Impaired; Vocational Rehabilita-tion	Workforce Investment Act Resource Centers	$25,000.00	$87,910.00	$25,000.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

This project will integrate assistive technology solutions into the Workforce Development One Stop Resource Centers to increase awareness of the potential of assistive technology to enhance the employability and productivity of persons with disabilities in competitive employment. Assistive technology solutions available for demonstration will include devices and accessibility alternatives that provide access to information technology (information systems, applications, and websites). Demonstration equipment at the One Stop Resource Centers will be available to individuals with disabilities, employers, programmers, and developers, which include the general public as well as state agencies and universities.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			$11,520		$11,520
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	$25,000	$76,390			$101,390
Total	$25,000	$76,390	$11,520		$112,910

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	16.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	12.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	8.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	14.3	15
TOTAL	**84.3**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Providing assistive technology that will ensure access to the services in the One Stop Resource Centers is an important project.
- Beneficiaries are well defined.
- Training will be provided for the staff.
- Commitment by VR and others is excellent.

WEAKNESSES

- The project should focus on the assistive technology that will provide access to the OSRCs' services and to e-government.
- The technology that will be provided is not specific to the goals of the OSRC and could be a difficulty. There should be more evidence of coordination with NCBVI, NCDHHI and Voc Rehab.
- Technology proposed will not provide optimum access to the services of the OSRCs for individuals with disabilities and therefore will not be demonstration of what assistive technology can provide for individuals with disabilities.
- There is no indication that the OSRC have agreed to participate. There is no real time line even for the Centers that are about to open.
- The assistive technology provided will not provide access to blind individuals, as Zoomtext requires some sight in order to use it. The software outlined runs on different platforms and some of it is more appropriate for K-12 environments than the employment world. Some of the software cannot be loaded on the same system as it will not operate together (e.g. Dragon and Zoomtext).

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-02

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
State Fire Marshal and Nebraska Forest Service at the Univ. of Nebraska	All-Incident Reporting System	$69,956.00	$29,966.00	$0.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The State Fire Marshal and the Nebraska Forest Service at the University of Nebraska either direct or require emergency response organizations to report fire emergencies. Last year NITC funded a State Fire Marshal project to survey the feasibility of computerized reporting and the necessity of reporting to the State by local emergency response organizations. The statistics and analytical reports support the proposed project to assist in the purchase and training for incident reporting software. This project would provide funding support for purchasing vendor software for the emergency response organizations and provide them with sufficient training to submit these required reports per any time constraints.

Management of the project will be coordinated through a reimbursement program for those emergency response organizations to receive funding after purchasing vendor software for incident reporting. Additionally, the project will assist in the funding of training courses on the operation and implementation of the software at the local level. For those emergency response organizations that have already purchased vendor software, a retroactive reimbursement will be offered. Options will be provided for additional software program levels to be purchased which will assist the organizations with other necessary documentation that enhances the overall data collection and statistical analysis completed by State Agencies, such as records on personnel, training, apparatus, equipment, and budgeting issues.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			17,560.00		17,560.00
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	69,956.00				69,956.00
Supplies and Materials			2,000.00		2,000.00
Training			1,100.00		1,100.00
Travel			9,306.00		9,306.00
Total	69,956.00		29,966.00		99,922.00

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	16.0	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.0	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.3	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	7.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	7.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	13.0	15
TOTAL	**81.0**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Good overall description of project. Good evidence of benefit to other entities.
- Moderately good narrative about other possible approaches. Documented statutory reference. Reasonable narrative about intangible benefit
- Stakeholder analysis is thorough.
- Hardware, software not particularly risky.
- Standardizing software/reporting is essential.

WEAKNESSES

- Dramatic increase in reported incidents may be somewhat optimistic
- Virtually no cost/benefit analysis based on hard numbers.
- Implementation info is extremely high-level.
- Security issues not addressed very thoroughly. Related to scalability, coordination among many sources of input not very thoroughly discussed.
- Not much commentary on implementation risk.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-03

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
Office of the Chief Information Officer	E-Government Architecture Study	$50,000.00	$15,000.00	Withdrawn by applicant $0.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The purpose of this project is to define the technical architecture for deploying e-government services in state government. A well-defined technical architecture will guide investments in the technical infrastructure that is essential to facilitate rapid and cost-effective implementation of e-government services.

Section 86-1506 (6) requires the Nebraska Information Technology Commission to adopt technical standards, guidelines and architectures upon recommendation by the Technical Panel. In August 2000, the Technical Panel created a work group to evaluate the adequacy of the state's technical infrastructure for e-government and make recommendations. The charter for the work group included the following goals:

1. Prepare a checklist of key foundational prerequisites for implementing e-government
2. Inventory capabilities of the state's foundation for e-government;
3. Assess capabilities of the state's foundation for e-government
4. Review and revise best practices for the electronic government architecture
5. Recommend policies, standards and guidelines for the electronic government architecture

The work group accomplished part of the first goal by developing a draft document on e-government architecture. (A copy is available at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/tp/workgroups/egovernment/index.htm.) The draft document identified principles, components, and guidelines for the presentation layer and enterprise services that together comprise two of the conceptual layers of the technical infrastructure for e-government. The workgroup was not able to develop guidelines for applications and data, which constitute the third layer.

The work group lacks the resources to complete the task assigned to it. This grant would enable the work group to retain a consulting firm to assist it. Finishing the inventory, assessment, and best practices and documenting standards and guidelines for the e-government architecture will provide the state with a benchmark for evaluating future progress.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			10,000	5,000	15,000
Contractual Services	50,000	5,000		10,000	65,000
Total	50,000	5,000	10,000	15,000	80,000

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	19.7	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	14.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	18.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.7	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	9.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	10.0	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	14.3	15
TOTAL	**96.0**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Directly relates to state technical plan and emphasis on improving e-government.
- Well thought out. Clear and concise with realistic objectives and approaches.
- Beneficiaries and outcomes are well defined. Measurements and assessment methods well stated.
- This project is not technically difficult. The issue will be culture and a willingness of agencies to work together for the common good of all.
- Again the biggest risk is culture and willingness to change how we do things. This study will go a long way towards convincing agencies that proceeding with E-Government is realistic and achievable.
- As important as this study is I hope we don't short change ourselves. I for one would suggest spending even more if necessary. The benefits will surely out way the costs if we do this right.

WEAKNESSES

- No specific reference to NIS or other such initiatives already in progress.
- Open ended study of how to study. "Recommendation for on-going evaluation of the state's e-government architecture." Will there be a request for further funds to accomplish this?
- Tangible economic benefits are hypothetical.
- Doing nothing is the only alternative examined. They might have examined conducting the study using only state personnel, or only consultants with no state personnel.
- Who are the stakeholders?

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-04

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
Office of the Chief Information Officer	HIPAA Assessment and Strategy for State Government	$30,000.00	$10,000.00	Withdrawn by applicant $0.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

In 1996 Congress enacted the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). So far, two rules have been finalized. A final rule regarding security is expected soon. Other rules are still in progress. Below are the publication dates and compliance deadlines for three rules that demand immediate attention. Further information is available at http://aspe.os.dhhs.gov/admnsimp/.

Rule	Publication Date	Compliance
Transaction and Code Set	Final rule -- 8/17/2000	10/16/2002
Privacy	Final rule -- 12/28/2000	4/14/2003
Security	Notice of Proposed Rule -- 8/12/1998	TBA

There are both civil and criminal penalties for non-compliance. Criminal penalties range up to $250,000 and 10 years in prison for anyone obtaining or disclosing protected health information with the intent to sell, transfer or use it for commercial advantage, personal gain or malicious harm.

HIPAA represents a significant challenge for state government, because of legal liability, the complexity of the regulations, uncertainty about what entities are affected, cost of compliance, and the short timeframe for implementation. In general, HIPAA affects agencies that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Do you bill for medical services?
- Do you pay for medical services?
- Do you generate, maintain, or use individually identifiable health information?
- Do you have information that is used for eligibility or enrollment in health-related programs?
- Are you a business partner of an entity that conducts any of these activities?

The complexity of the federal regulations and the potential liability to the state suggest the need for agencies to cooperate with each other and coordinate their efforts. Agencies must analyze the impact of HIPAA and decide on a course of action to achieve compliance.

The Department of Health and Human Services has conducted an initial self-assessment and is organizing a HIPAA project office to oversee its department-wide effort to achieve compliance with HIPAA requirements. Other state agencies have not begun a self-assessment and may not even be aware of HIPAA regulations.

This project will assist agencies in evaluating the impact of HIPAA regulations on their operations and technology systems and to prepare a course of action to achieve compliance.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			10,000		10,000
Contractual Services	30,000				30.000
Total	30,000		10,000		40,000

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	19.0	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	14.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	18.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.7	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	9.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.0	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.3	15
TOTAL	**91.3**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Good intro and connection to the enterprise/collaborative nature of the project and mission.
- Goals and objectives are specific and clearly explained.
- Scope and projected outcomes contain specifics about products and how success will be measured.
- This is a project with significant justification for carrying it out and significant risk if it is not undertaken.
- Challenges are well defined.

WEAKNESSES

- Budget lacks detail.
- Key challenge is the time to do the self-assessment. The expert training proposed is a key ingredient.
- Question the validity of the time line and costs.
- Strategies on time and cost identified, but question if they will work.
- In kind match from the agencies may be very difficult to get with the budget cuts and NIS already taking agency resources.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-05

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
Office of the Chief Information Officer	Security Assessment	$46,800.00	$15,700.00	$46,800.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

In January, the NITC adopted a set of security policies. The parent policy (Information Security Management Policy) provides guidance for establishing effective security programs. One requirement is to conduct regular security audits. The Network Security Policy states that "an audit of network security should be conducted annually.

The HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) proposed rule for Security and Electronic Signature Standards (45 CFR Part 142) imposes a comprehensive set of security requirements for "covered entities" that "electronically maintain or transmit any health information relating to an individual." The regulations pertaining to "Administrative Procedures to Guard Data Integrity, Confidentiality, and Availability" includes a requirement for "Security Testing." Given the breadth of HIPAA requirements and the potential penalties for violators, state government requires an independent evaluation of compliance efforts.

The purpose of this grant is to engage a qualified firm to conduct a security audit and security testing of the state's information technology infrastructure.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			12,500		12,500
Contractual Services	46,800	3,200			50,000
Total	46,800	3,200	12,500		62,500

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	17.7	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	12.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	17.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	9.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	13.0	15
TOTAL	**87.7**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Meets the comprehensive technology plan and describes how it furthers electronic government.
- An enterprise approach for this type of project is probably the most appropriate way to handle a security review.
- The timeline is fairly aggressive, however, I believe this is strength.

WEAKNESSES

- Identifying the weaknesses in security is only one step. The report needs to be sure that it provides remedies on correcting the problems.
- I am concerned about the statement that for the dollars available it will be difficult to achieve all of the objectives of the study. Are the dollars being requested too low or are the objectives too high? Which one should be adjusted?
- Expected outcome should have more detail concerning the report.
- The number of servers/systems that will be scanned will determine the cost of the project. More detail on the number of servers is needed to determine if this cost is appropriate.
- An additional outcome should be the review by the auditor with each agency of the results and possible remedies. Another assessment may be an evaluation of the results by the CIO's office AND each of the agencies audited.
- This needs to be mandatory for agencies. Their cooperation should be in developing the RFP statement of work.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-06

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
Department of Natural Resources (Multiple Agencies)	Creating a Common Framework for Integrating Surface Water Data	$25,000.00	$18,200.00	$25,000.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

This project is part of a larger collaborative effort to develop a standardized, statewide, surface water features database (map), to facilitate the collection and integration of data and public policies of multiple state, local, and federal agencies that make or implement public policies related to Nebraska's surface water. Specifically, this project will develop a digital, (1:24,000-scale) geospatial database (map), with associated attributes, for the surface water features in the Lower Elkhorn Watershed in eastern Nebraska (all or parts of these counties: Burt, Dodge, Stanton, Washington, Platte Sarpy, Saunders Thurston, Cuming, Madison, Wayne Colfax, and Douglas). This geospatial database will be based on a National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) model, which has been endorsed by the Nebraska GIS Steering Committee and which was specifically designed to provide a common reference, surface water database to facilitate multipurpose use and inter-agency collaboration.

The project will convert existing paper maps to digital geospatial format, update the stream locations from these 1950-60s vintage paper maps based on modern aerial photography, and provide standardized database identifiers for all surface water features. The project will facilitate the collaborative use of modern information technology, such as geographic information systems (GIS), in the important public policy area of surface water by developing a standardized database for this one geographic area. The project will make information more accessible to the general public by facilitating the use of information technology tools, such as GIS, to graphically display the implications of public policies and issues related to surface water. The project is a collaborative effort undertaken by the Department of Natural Resources, the Conservation and Survey Division of the University of Nebraska, the Department of Environmental Quality, the Department of Roads, and the Lower Elkhorn Natural Resources District.

This project is a response to the Nebraska GIS Steering Committee decision to prioritize the development a standardized, statewide hydrographic dataset. Work has already been completed in the Logan Creek watershed and is about to begin in the Salt Creek Watershed. As part of a larger effort to pool the resources from multiple agencies and thereby enable the statewide development this database, this grant funding would also be used to provide a match for federal funding that will be used to complete other basins.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs	$2,000		$15,800		$17,800
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	$ 4,000 hdwr $ 5,000 sftwr			$5,000 Roads	$14,000
Contractual Services	$12,000 othr		$1,000	$3,000 - LENRD $5,000 - NDEQ	$21,000
Supplies and Materials			$ 1,400		$1,400
Training	$2,000				$2,000
Total	$25,000		$18,200	$13,000	$56,200

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	18.7	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	14.7	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	18.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.3	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	9.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	13.7	15
TOTAL	**93.0**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Multi-agency and integration of state system with federal system.
- Following existing standards and formats.
- The project makes excellent use of collaboration among a number of state agencies. It responds especially well to the State Government Council's goal of implementing electronic government.
- The listing of beneficiaries, expected outcomes, and measurement methods are excellent.
- The evaluation of other potential solutions was well-detailed and complete. The intangible benefits include the suggestion of a precedent or statewide standard for future hydrographic databases--a desired outcome.
- The implementation plan is complete and well thought-out.
- Risk assessment was very complete and detailed--an excellent analysis.

WEAKNESSES

- DNR listed as responsible for on-going costs, but no statement as to how those specific costs would be covered by DNR.
- Hardware and software of initial system well defined, but no accommodation for increased LAN infrastructure and bandwidth as public begins to access system.
- The proposal does explain how the grant will benefit the Lower Elkhorn Watershed and its utilization as a Federal match for other hydrographic databases but does not explain how much more state money may be required to complete the entire statewide database.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-07

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
IMServices (Multiple Agencies)	Information Technology Support Tools Project	$105,000.00	$37,000.00	$74,000.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The project to implement an IT Support Tools System is a joint project with the Department of Correctional Services, the Department of Labor's Workforce Development group, Health and Human Services Systems, Worker's Compensation Court, and DAS Information Management Services. These agencies are working together to replace and upgrade aging technical support software. The project also provides some of the agencies with new, needed software function. The system will include problem management (help desk), hardware/software management (technology assets tracking), change management, and knowledge bases. We anticipate that the selected product could become an enterprise-standard software because it offers current technologies, improved efficiency and effectiveness in overall technical support, and will benefit agencies with better communication, exchange of support data, and cost-effectiveness.

A number of agencies use some type of formal help-desk software. In addition, some agencies have adopted automated methods of tracking technology assets. The agencies recognize the need to link these two sources of information to each other and to the change management process and any available knowledge bases. The project aims towards this goal and would fulfill the immediate needs of several state agencies. In addition, we anticipate that in the future as agencies seek to replace their current software, a well-planned, solid enterprise-wide solution would be in place.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			5,000		5,000
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)					
- Servers		30,000			
- Software, licensing	100,000				
- Maintenance	5,000				135,000
Training			2,000		2,000
Total	$105,000	$30,000	$7,000		$142,000

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	18.0	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	17.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	8.3	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.3	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.3	15
TOTAL	**86.3**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- I agree with what they are proposing, but just not clear on the details.
- If the project succeeds the outcomes will be significant. I am still confused as to whether this is an ERP type of solution, a smaller system focus or a help desk focus. I find myself having to re-read the document several times
- The business case for similar IT support tools is clear. Key, in my view, is the commitment of senior leadership. Another question is why limit this to just a few agencies?
- The risks that were identified are real. I think they should use the commitment to NIS to leverage the need for this project

WEAKNESSES

- Seems a bit optimistic judging from previous meetings concerning this effort.
- One of the biggest risks in my estimation is that the agencies participating will either not agree on the software requirements or that the requirements will be so broad that a solution will not be easily implemented.
- It seems to me that the participating agencies (especially the large ones could generate more cash to support the project. I am also concerned about annual support costs as $5,000 seems a little low for a $100,000 product. I would expect it to be more.
- Server costs seem low and I would rather see more allocated to that component. Training costs are also low.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-08

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
IMServices	Enterprise E-Government Security Software	$151,000.00	(See Funding Summary)	Withdrawn by applicant $0.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

In January, 2000, the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC) adopted the first statewide E-government Strategic Plan, which was later endorsed by the Governor. This plan outlined four priorities to help guide the effort. Two of the items deemed critical to the success of the E-government Strategic Plan were Security and Technical Infrastructure. This project is an Enterprise approach to address those two items. It will implement a technical infrastructure that will aid in keeping the State's data secure, reduce redundant software purchases between Agencies, and provide a technical starting point for allowing Agencies to easily share data.

This enterprise approach would allow for all collaborating Agencies, Boards, and Commissions to have a central point where their users' computer accesses could be added, maintained, and deleted through the use of integrated computer security software. This project would purchase, implement, administer, and train State staff in the use of this Enterprise Computer Security Software. A central staff would administer this software, and would act as a resource for those Agencies, Boards, and Commissions that chose to use the software to maintain their users' computer access records. It would also be possible for this administration staff to maintain the computer accessibility records of Agencies, Boards, and Commissions that do not have the staff or resources to do so. In this way, the State's staff and resources would be leveraged to improve services, as well as increase efficiency and effectiveness of the State's operations.

This project would also provide software to assist in Enterprise directory management, security rules management, authentication, and intrusion detection in the State's networks. This software would utilize an Enterprise approach to address the seven policies of the NITC's Security Architecture work group. Addressing these policies will also help enable the State of Nebraska to comply with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).

The Enterprise Computer Security software would be used to manage computer logon accessibility and authentication, and other security concerns for the State's computer systems. The computer systems would include the Internet and Intranet systems, all aspects of the State's Enterprise server (i.e., CICS, VM, TSO, and other sub-systems), the State's AS/400 computers and networks, and PC LAN/WAN accesses and security for any Agency, Board, or Commission wishing to participate.

This software could be purchased and implemented at one time, or it could be purchased and implemented in phases. Anticipated costs for both approaches are included in this grant.

FUNDING SUMMARY

NOTE: There are 2 approaches used on this grant. The first approach is for purchase and implementation in one phase, with a 2-year maintenance and support agreement. The second approach is for a multi-phased approach over 2.5 years, with an additional 6-month maintenance and support agreement. See the grant application for more detail on the funding

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			$1,587,000		
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	$1,200,000				
Contractual Services	$275,000				
Total	$1,475,000		$1,587,000		$3,062,000

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	18.7	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.0	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	18.0	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	9.0	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.0	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	11.3	15
TOTAL	**87.0**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Extensive information on how this will be implemented.
- Enterprise Goals are consistent with the State's E-government strategy.
- This Project is of potential benefit to nearly all state agencies
- Potential benefit is much greater than the cost
- Looks to be a well thought out implementation plan

WEAKNESSES

- Not a clear definition of the alternative solutions or what happens if we do nothing
- Cost is high, and benefits somewhat difficult to quantify

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-09

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
IMServices	Enterprise Security Awareness Training Grant	$36,620.00	$57,000.00	$36,620.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

In January, 2000, the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC) adopted the first statewide E-government Strategic Plan, which was later endorsed by the Governor. It was stated in this document that security was a priority of the State at an Enterprise level. The NITC Security Architecture Workgroup developed 7 policies, one of which addresses Education, Training, and Awareness. It is stated in this policy that all State employees and other State agents need to be aware of their responsibility towards Security.

The Federal Government is also beginning to mandate certain security steps be taken before states and other organizations can use certain data. The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) has issued five rules. The State of Nebraska has until February, 2003, to comply with the Security and Privacy Rule. Although this seems far into the future, the items listed in this rule will take time to implement.

Funding is needed for a Security Awareness training program to occur at an Enterprise level. Some initial plans are being developed for the initial Rollout of this program. This grant will fund some initial training and will provide a Security Consultant to assist the Security Officers as they attempt to understand Security in their Agencies, Boards, and Commissions.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs	$30,770		$57,000		
Supplies and Materials	$5,850				
Total	$36,620		$57,000		$93,620

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	17.7	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.7	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	17.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	8.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	9.0	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.0	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	13.7	15
TOTAL	**87.3**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Project meets E-government strategy and does a good job of describing the goals and objectives of the project.
- Project proposal does and excellent job describing specific outcomes.
- Seems reasonable for security training costs.

WEAKNESSES

- I think agency security personnel should be involved in defining security training needs and this is not noted in the application.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-10

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
IMServices (Multiple Agencies)	Lotus Notes Interagency Collaboration Education Project	$1,000.00	$935.00	$0.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Lotus Notes Interagency Collaboration Work Group, sponsored by the State Government Council, seeks a grant for the purpose of promoting knowledge about Lotus Notes and similar methods for interagency collaboration. The goal is to better educate participating agencies about current state technologies and promote the use of Lotus Notes and other advance methods for interagency collaboration solutions.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			600		600
Contractual Services	500				500
Supplies and Materials	500		335		885
Total	1000		935		1935

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	7.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	8.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	11.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	6.3	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	7.0	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	7.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	11.3	15
TOTAL	**59.7**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Costs appear reasonable.

WEAKNESSES

- Although seeking a modest budget, the proposal failed to detail the specific goals and objectives to be accomplished.
- Tangible and intangible benefits were referred to in very general terms. It was difficult to get a sense of the actual benefits that would be delivered.
- It is not clear what events are planned, who the audience is, or what is hoped to be accomplished.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-11

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
IMServices and Workers' Compensation Court	Enterprise Content Management Study	$100,000.00	$35,000.00	$100,000.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Enterprise Content Management Project is a two-phase undertaking to address the methodology of systematically organizing the State's electronic information resources so that the resources can be managed, secured, and made available as required. Conceptually, the need for enterprise content management combines interagency business knowledge, policies, information content, work processes, and technology with an overlying architecture that can deliver the content via a flexible, adaptive, portal-based service accessed with a single sign-on.

During phase one, collaborating agencies will investigate the needs of the different sectors of government for information resources management. Agencies have begun work with the Secretary of State in this effort. They also will research and analyze enterprise-wide solutions to determine a course of action. The Court Administrator's Office is looking at content management as a potential solution for their case management system. During phase two, a process will be implemented to begin the transition to an enterprise-wide solution. It will provide a working production model and a set of best practices.

The issue of managing electronic content or informational resources, is that as more and more state documents are stored electronically rather than in traditional filing cabinets, it is necessary to rethink the process and adjust how we manage records and data. Moving from the physical and cumbersome limitations of paper-based business methods to the potential of unlimited and instant access in the computerized and networked world makes it a requirement to adjust policy and practice.

In addition, the large investment in a diversity of automation and storage solutions in state government has created the need to offer a common portal to all information and insure a sound method of maintaining, securing, and preserving it. A Gartner, Inc. study confirms that, because of funding methods and political boundaries, much of government has responded to e-business initiatives with "individual agency silos" which can disrupt efforts for information, application, and infrastructure reuse.

Additionally, the Internet has changed the expectations in the business place, including state government business. Today citizens, businesses, and employees demand that information in all forms will be there at their fingertips and will be accessed easily and efficiently.

The technology to deliver better service in information resource management has been developing quickly and a number of companies are promoting different methodologies to implement it. The collaborating agencies will analyze what is available and determine a solution which best meets the identified needs and will begin the process required to implement it.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs					30,000
Phase 1	0	0	5,000		
Phase 2	0	0	25,000		
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)					55,000
Phase 1	0	0	0		
Phase 2	50,000	0	5,000		
Contractual Services					50,000
Phase 1	50,000	0	0		
Phase 2	0	0	0		
Total	100,000		35,000		135,000

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	18.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.7	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	18.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	7.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.7	15
TOTAL	**86.0**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- I like the notion of the two-phased approach.
- I believe the benefits will more than outweigh the costs. This is a good project

WEAKNESSES

- I do have a worry with this statement "After the completion of the first phase, it will be necessary to involve top administration to review the feasibility of the proposal and whether it successfully addresses the enterprise-wide needs of state government."
- Still concerned about the apparent lack of senior level support.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-12

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
IMServices (Multiple Agencies)	Automated Legislative Bill Tracking	$20,000.00	$6,700.00	$0.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

Workers' Compensation Court, Health and Human Services, and the Department of Administrative Services' divisions currently use a 'legislative bill' tracking application that requires manual entry of bill information. The application allows Lotus Notes users to enter information about legislative bills of specific interest to their agency along with their working notes. State agencies need to handle large subsets of bills and bill data during each session while coordinating efforts and maintaining working notes.

These agencies, along with the Department of Roads, have joined in a collaborative project to plan enhancements to the application and provide it with automation. The objective of this project is to analyze the requirements to automate much of the data entry and then implement a solution to offer the best return on investment. Coordination with the Clerk of Legislature's office is necessary for data access. At a minimum, the application would access the 'one-liner' file to retrieve pertinent bill information. A more sophisticated solution would emulate some of the functions of the previous mainframe system known as NLSIS. It would update the user's tracking file with the most current bill status information from a read-access to the Legislature's database. In addition, it would link to relevant web sites such as the Unicameral home page.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs	20,000		6,700		26,700
Total	20,000		6,700		26,700

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	16.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	12.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.7	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	7.3	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	11.0	15
TOTAL	**79.7**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- This project has a strong collaborative component with apparent buy in from some very major players.
- The possibility of automating bill tracking for various agencies appears very promising. The suggested ideas for enhancements to the process are right on target.
- The technical description of the project seems reasonable.

WEAKNESSES

- An estimate is given of 85 hours of analysis work, but no estimate is given of the time needed to do the development work.
- I am bothered that this project does not have buy-in from the one entity that holds the show stopping card. If the Legislature says no, does the grant money come back?
- The estimate of 85 hours for the analysis phase seems high. I would think that agencies already know the content or critical elements of bill tracking.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-13

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
Nebraska Arts Council	Continuation of E-granting conversion project	$40,000.00	$14,000.00	$0.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Nebraska Arts Council is requesting funds to continue the conversion of its grant application and review process to an **e-granting system**. Converting the agency's grants system to e-granting will eventually allow the agency to manage the entire application and review process electronically. This would drastically simplify the application process for nonprofit organizations requesting grant funds, and would allow the agency to re-allocate staff resources to other agency priorities. The NAC will work with schools, libraries, and higher education institutions to ensure Internet access for all applicants.

Background:

The NAC annually processes between 400 and 500 grant applications, submitted by schools, churches, and nonprofit organizations across the state. The applications go through a review process that includes an evaluation of the proposal by either a private citizen who has volunteered to be a grant reviewer, or by a panel of citizens who assemble at a public meeting to review grants. Currently, applicants submit from three to 18 hard copies of the application and attachments; this requires considerable time to assemble their grant application packets, and often represents a considerable investment for copying and mailing.

NAC staff must enter application information into the grants management database, collate the grants into books for panel reviews, and send the applications to panelists two to three weeks prior to the public grant panel review meeting. Panelists receive boxes containing up to 35 grant applications to read and assess, and must bring all the applications to the panel meeting in Omaha.

During 2000-01, the NAC worked with the State of Nebraska's Information Management Services in developing a pilot project to put one of its most-used grant applications online. This application should be available online by the first of January, with four other applications online shortly thereafter. During 2001-02 the NAC will also work with a vendor to develop on-line final reporting forms. By 2004 the agency will have in place a system for receiving applications with digital signatures.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			$14,000		$14,000
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	$5,000				$5,000
Contractual Services	$35,000				$35,000
Total	$40,000		$14,000		$54,000

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	17.0	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	12.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	7.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	3.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	13.3	15
TOTAL	**79.0**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Scope and outcome seem manageable and well laid out.
- Project justification and business case is well laid out.
- Emphasis on working with customers (grant applicants) is good

WEAKNESSES

- Would like to see a little more detail before I am entirely comfortable with projected costs.
- It is not clear how much work was accomplished with the original NITC grant and why the NAC plans to buy a completely different e-granting system rather than building on the original pilot project.
- It is not clear how many grant programs will be automated, if this project is approved.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-14

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
State Patrol	Mobile Data Computer (MDC) Project and Remote Terminal Server (RTS) Project	$53,227.00	$100,000.00	$31,070.25

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The State Patrol is requesting $49,927 in grant funds to improve public safety by increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of approximately 150 Nebraska State Patrol officers and to further the Agency's technological goals and objectives. This application focuses on two areas of business process improvement. The first project is referred to as the MDC (Mobile Data Computer) Project. The objective of the MDC Project is to increase the amount of information provided to four (4) Headquarters Troop traffic officers by installing mobile data computers and 800 MHz radios in their marked patrol vehicles. The MDCs will have connectivity to the City of Lincoln's 800 MHz trunked radio system which allows them wireless, high speed connectivity to the Nebraska State Patrol Switcher. The Switcher is the device that allows access to all Federal and state databases. The project will provide the officers with the tools necessary to access these law enforcement data systems directly. Currently, officers often wait in que for dispatcher response. The goal of this project is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of four Nebraska State Patrol troopers. This directive will enhance a pilot project consisting of one officer utilizing the MDC system in cooperation with the City of Lincoln. This project will require the purchase of laptops, computers, wireless network infrastructure hardware, software and licensing. The City of Lincoln is providing the 800 Mhz radios to the Nebraska State Patrol.

The second project is referred to as the RTS (Remote Terminal Server) Project. The goal of the RTS project is to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of approximately 150 Nebraska State Patrol officers using dial up connections to the agency's network. The objective is to decrease the amount of time officers spend completing on-line reports (some extremely lengthy) due to slow dial up infrastructures. The solution proposed is to implement a Microsoft Terminal Server system that will allow the officers to fill out their reports over the low cost dial up lines at an increased speed. This solution will require a server, security appliances, network infrastructure hardware, software and licensing.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	$49,527.00			$100,000.00	$149,527.00
Telecommunications	$3,300.00				$3,300.00
Other costs	$400.00				$400.00
Total	$53,227.00			$100,000.00	$153,227.00

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	16.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	12.0	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	18.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.7	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.3	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	11.7	15
TOTAL	**82.7**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Clearly shows how the projects (there are two distinct projects in this request) relate to the Patrol Tech Plan.
- The MDC project appears to increase officer efficiency and the RTS project appears to increase efficiency at other locations.
- MDC is a joint project involving not only State Government but also the City of Lincoln. The City has been doing MDC for some time and implementation should not be an issue.
- It is clear that these projects would increase the efficiency of the State Patrol operations.

WEAKNESS

- All information appears to be based on testimonials and stories. Measurements of project outcomes will also be measured by testimonials. It would appear that a clearer measurement would be the number of inquiries, reports filed, etc. In order to evaluate the MDC project we believe a much tighter scope and list of outcomes should be set.
- The RTS project does not contain a description of the hardware, software or communications required for this system that can be evaluated. An "enterprise-class" server does not adequately allow for a technical assessment of the hardware. At one point the application refers to "wireless network infrastructure" related to RTS. I am not sure what the technical aspects are.
- The financials are very weak. It appears that there is a grant request for $100,000 that will be used as a match. However, the projects clearly state (under the implementation portion of the app) that a grant application was submitted in March 2001 for a COPS grant that has not been received and notifications should be made in early fall. It is impossible to determine whether there are matching funds for each project or they were submitted together so that the $100,000 would more than match both projects. These should have been submitted as two separate projects since they are not inter-dependent.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-15

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired	Accessible E-Government	$26,900.00	$10,487.00	$0.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

This project will allow the Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired (NCBVI) to complete the network infrastructure needed to facilitate more effective methods of information storage and processing. The project will involve setting up local area networks in each of NCBVI's six offices across the state. This will allow each office to have centralized, secure data storage as well as share resources such as printers and high speed Internet connections, paving the way for a wide area network over which all Commission staff can share data from a comprehensive case management system. It will allow Commission staff to readily access state and federal E-Government services available via the Internet, thus enhancing opportunities for high quality employment outcomes for blind and visually impaired persons receiving services from the Commission. This project will have an emphasis on training clients as well as staff to take advantage of E-Government services available from other government entities. This will also involve training to use Internet resources from outside of our offices, which is of particular importance in rural areas of the State where it is not feasible to have clients come to our office for service and training. The project will greatly improve the efficiency of NCBVI's service delivery system by establishing staff access to client and fiscal data statewide, eliminating parallel duplicative information management systems in the six offices, and facilitating collaboration with all other Nebraska state entities operating via electronic, on-line systems.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			4,179		4,179
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	18,000		2,268		20,268
Contractual Services	8,900		4,040		12,940
Total	26,900		10,487		37,387

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	16.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.0	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	7.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.0	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.0	15
TOTAL	**80.3**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Goals and objectives are clearly stated and would serve to further the implementation of e-government.
- Beneficiaries and their needs are clearly provided. Expected outcomes are also clear and assessment procedures will verify project outcomes.
- Project justification and business case were well and comprehensively presented. The implementation plan is comprehensive. Risks and strategies were well presented. Budget is well-defined and looks to be reasonable for the project.

WEAKNESSES

- Needed to identify cost/benefit beyond the federal match this would make available, for example dollar savings in staff time, reductions in other costs, etc.
- Little discussion of stakeholder acceptance, little specific identification of training and support planning

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-16

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
HHSS and IMServices	Employee Training Record System	$15,000.00	$5,000.00	$0.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

HHSS maintains employee-training records for the purpose of assuring participation in required sessions. These records are used to satisfy accreditation of facility services and/or specific professional licensing boards for employees needing to maintain a professional license/certification/competency. This proposal is for a single agency-wide tracking system that will meet this need and interface with employee records housed in the Nebraska Information System in the future. Currently, HHSS tracks employee training records using two mainframe applications and one stand-alone PC database. In the absence of a single database, generating uniform and consistent information for system-wide reporting or analysis is not feasible.

The application is Lotus Notes-based and electronic workflow and web accessibility is part of the design plan. Once completed, IMServices and other state agencies using Lotus Notes for e-mail could adopt the system.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Personnel Costs			2,000		2,000
Contractual Services	15,000	1,500			16,500
Training			1,500		1,500
Total	15,000	1,500	3,500		20,000

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	17.0	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	11.7	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	15.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.7	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.0	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	7.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.3	15
TOTAL	**80.0**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

WEAKNESSES

- Was a non-Lotus Notes database program considered? If an off-the-shelf Lotus Notes product cost more than a custom application, is Lotus Notes really a good investment for the State of Nebraska? A stronger business case could have been made.
- Training and staff development requirements are not detailed. Good narrative description but no financial estimates included in cost benefit section.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-17

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
UNL – Conservation and Survey Division	Creating Digital Access and Archiving of the Conservation and Survey Division Aerial Photography Collection	$57,200.00	$40,300.00	$0.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Conservation and Survey Division (CSD), University of Nebraska-Lincoln, houses a large and valuable collection of tens of thousands of aerial photographs. The majority of these 9"x9" photographs were taken between the 1930s and 1970s. The aerial photography collection is a critical and widely used resource for natural resource planners, land managers, educators and the general public. In addition, many of the land areas have multiple images spanning different time periods. The spatial and temporal aspects of the aerial photography make for a unique and historically significant collection. This project has been identified as a high priority by the CSD administration.

Currently, the collection only exists as hardcopy photographs. The only availability to our clientele is to physically visit our office. When photographs are requested, our only option is to have high quality copies made from the UNL Printing and Duplicating office. The cost of duplication is significant and adds to the handling and wear of the original photography. Due to the age and heavy use of these photographs, a significant portion of the aerial photography collection is rapidly deteriorating. In order to preserve the collection for future users, it is necessary to digitally archive the collection as soon as possible.

In June 2000, we were fortunate to receive an initial $32,300 grant from the NITC for this project. These funds allowed us to purchase the necessary equipment and to scan and store approximately 22,000 aerial photographs. Since that time, it has become clear that we have many more aerial photographs than originally thought. In addition, we have come across a significant number of photographs that need cleaning prior to scanning. Several years/decades ago these photographs were marked on with grease pencils by the public and/or researchers. As a result, we have had to devote extensive efforts to clean these prior to scanning.

At the time of this writing, there was approximately $1,500 left in this original grant. Clearly, this will not be enough to finish this project. Therefore, with the funds requested in this application, as well as the funds recently received from the Nebraska State Records Board, we hope to complete this important project.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match (1)	In-Kind Match (2)	Other Funding Sources	Total (3)
Personnel Costs	$ 52,000.00		$ 13,000.00	$25,000.00 $32,300.00	$ 122,300.00
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.)	$ 4,200.00		$ 300.00		$ 4,500.00
Supplies and Materials	$ 1,000.00		$ 1,000.00		$ 2,000.00
Training			$ 1,000.00		$ 1,000.00
Total	**$ 57,200.0**		**$ 15,300.0**	**$ 57,300.0**	**$ 129,800.00**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	18.0	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	11.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	8.3	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.0	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	3.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	8.0	15
TOTAL	**73.7**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- There is a strong relationship between the project and the agency's comprehensive technology plan. The goals and objectives are simple and accomplishable. The e-government component described would be advantageous for Nebraska's citizens and state agencies.
- The beneficiaries and outcomes are clearly defined.

WEAKNESSES

- One goal is to improve public access to the aerial photographs, but the objectives do not include the option of Internet access.
- Scope is not well defined. The original project greatly underestimated the amount of work to be done. The current project still does not quantify the amount of work to be done
- The application does not quantify the number of requests handled in a typical month and the time saved by staff from having 22,000 photographs in digital form.
- The application refers to the need for additional storage space, but does not explain how this will be addressed.
- Given the experience of digitizing 22,000 photographs, the budget explanation should be based on solid projections of remaining photographs and average time to clean and scan them.
- There is some risk in that the project, if funded, may not complete the digital scanning before the grant funds expire or are exhausted.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-18

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
Commission on the Status of Women	Hardware Upgrades and Software	$5512.50	$1837.50	$0.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

As a result of technological upgrades, and with assistance & instruction from a database consultant the Commission staff will be more time and cost efficient in serving the women of Nebraska and thirty Commissioners across the state.

The essential goal is to purchase two computers to update the remaining two staff, who are still using Windows 95, Pentium 133 Mhz, with 16 MB RAM. An IMS specialist recently stated the two computers are at a high risk of "crashing". Additionally, they are unable to load an anti-virus software, and are unable to open most email attachments/files from other agencies. The CD-RW Drives will allow present computers a means of backing-up and sharing files.

With the acquisition of Adobe Acrobat 5.0 the staff webmaster could quickly convert documents, the Commission newsletter, forms, legislative information the Commission follows, and questionnaires to upload on the Commission website.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Capital Expenditures (Hardware, software, etc.) **2 IBM Computers**					
3 Color Inkjet Printers	**1800.00**		**600.00**		**2400.00**
2 External CD-RW Drives	**562.50**		**187.50**		**750.00**
Adobe Acrobat 5.0	**300.00**		**100.00**		**400.00**
	225.00		**75.00**		**300.00**
Contractual Services **(approx. 50 hrs @ $50/hr**	**1875.00**		**625.00**		**2500.00**
Telecommunications **"Campus Connection" cabling & set-up**	**375.00**		**125.00**		**500.00**
Other costs **Digital Camera**	**375.00**		**125.00**		**500.00**
Total	**$5512.00**		**$1837.50**		**$7350.00**

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	11.0	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	9.7	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	11.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	7.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	8.0	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.7	15
TOTAL	**67.7**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- This is a simple project and implementation should be fairly simple.
- Risks are minimal.

WEAKNESSES

- Too general. Not much evidence of benefit beyond agency itself. Is grant process designed to assist in technology updates in agencies?
- Seemingly most direct benefactors are within agency - more focused on current/replacement activities.
- Some general argument for upgrades, but not much in terms of cost/benefit or business case.
- Assumed that match should have been “Cash” not “In-Kind”

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-19

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
Dept. of Agriculture (Multiple Agencies)	Fee Collection Program	$9,900.00	$3,300.00	$0.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Nebraska Department of Agriculture (NDA) has administered a joint fee collection program for different commodities since approximately 1976. By statute, collections are made quarterly by first purchasers, and monthly for grain put under loan through the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Farm Service Agency (FSA). At the time the program was started, the commodities were a budget program within the NDA. The Wheat Board became a separate agency and the other commodities followed suit. When the various commodities were legislated into law, the NDA set up a central fee collection program. The computer program set up was a federal Ag Statistics program. Form were delivered over to the Federal Building, where they were key punched and batch processing took place. In the mid 1980s, when NDA set up a central data processing unit at the NSOB, several programs, including the fee collection program was transferred over to NDA and converted to run on a Data Point midrange computer system. Later, the NDA upgraded to an IBM AS400 central processor, which we currently operate. The fee collection program was upgraded to an RPG program format, currently used. The system is currently batch processing fee forms received. The reporting has had minimal changes over the last 25 years. The program works, but is slow, inflexible and needs updated to meet current needs.

To meet current needs, the fee collection program needs several updates made to it. The NDA proposes to make the program an online application so forms are calculated and edit checks are done at time of data entry. A deposit listing would be generated daily to accurately distribute revenue to the correct cash fund, versus putting the fees in suspense account and transferring once or twice a week. Edit error listings and exception reports could be ran and printed as needed. The new system would have the ability to run online queries and generate reports that contain only information the user needs. Currently, the computer system is capable of generating hard coded report formats set up 20+ years ago.

Also, the application would be made e-government compliant. Elevators and other entities could report data online and make payments via an electronic fund transfer or via credit card. We do accept credit card payments currently, but this is a manual process. This would shorten the time frame in receipting funds. Contact has been made to the Nebraska Grain and Feed Association, whose members make up the largest percentage of entities of first purchasers that report data each quarter. Due to consolidation, the number of first purchasers has decreased, but the entities reporting are the larger corporation types that have branch and terminal locations throughout the state. For example, the list includes Conagra, Peavey, Cargill, Scoular, Farmland Co-op's, Bunge, DeBruce etc. These corporate-type entities are all computerized, with central reporting locations that have capabilities to utilize e-government. They have indicated an interest in utilizing electronic filings. Several have indicated they want to know more of the details or see examples. For the calendar quarter of July, August and September, 2001 the department has submitted a survey to all first purchasers in the state. The results will not be known until after November, 2001.

The attached proposal would rewrite the current batch processing program to an online system to make the collection process accessible via internet and make the program e-government compliant.

A summary of the dollar amounts collected for each fund is a follows:

Corn Board	$2,500,000
Grain Sorghum Board	225,000

Wheat Board	1,000,000
Ethanol EPIC fund	4,000,000

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	Total
Personnel Costs	$8,025	$2,675			$10,700
Contractual Services	$1,500	$500			$2,000
Supplies and Materials	$375	$125			$500
Total	**$9,900**	**$3,300**	**-0-**	**-0-**	**$13,200**

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	Max.
Section III: Goals and Objectives	17.7	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.0	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	17.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	7.7	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.0	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	6.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.7	15
TOTAL	**83.3**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Great project. Multi-agency alignment critical

WEAKNESSES

- It is not clear who the project sponsor is or what milestones have to be achieved to meet the goal of finishing an application by the end of this December.
- User authentication is not addressed.
- Risks include the short timeframe, getting agreement of the several commodity boards, and acceptance of businesses paying the fees. Strategies are needed for these and any other risks that pertain to the project.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-20

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
Library Commission	Value-Added Book Reviews: Any Time, Any Place	$8,322.00	$2774.00	$8,322.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

Public and school libraries throughout Nebraska depend upon the Nebraska Library Commission to provide access to value-added reviews of books for young adults and children. Since 1993 the Commission has provided video recordings of oral reviews for 300 book titles twice a year. These reviews contain expertly chosen titles, presented in order to guarantee quality and usability for our nearly 280 public libraries and 600 school libraries. The reviews are broadcast over the state's videoconferencing system and then are made available via recorded videotape following the broadcast. Time required to watch all the tapes: approximately six hours.

Many people prefer the reviews as they are presently available, but an increasing number of libraries want the reviews to be made accessible in a greater variety of ways. Through a series of telephone interviews we have determined that the preferred alternative mode is via the Commission web site, an approach that will allow access any time, any place. It also allows direct access by specific book title, by author, by genre, and by reader age, among other categories. Through work and cooperation with staff of Nebraska Educational Telecommunications (NET), we have found a solution to providing this vital service. In essence each book review will present a digitized photo of the book's cover, and of one or more interior pages to show examples of illustrations and typeface; in addition the oral review by each reviewer will be presented via sound output.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Contractual Services	8,322	2,774			11,096
Total	8,322	2,774			11,096

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	18.3	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	13.0	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	16.7	20
Section VI: Implementation	9.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.7	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	9.3	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	13.3	15
TOTAL	**88.3**	**100**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Excellent stakeholder analysis.

WEAKNESSES

- No mention of potential increase in operational costs due to increased bandwidth demands as system increases in use. Who will cover those costs?
- One-time consultant project. What if it works and becomes popular? Will there be a follow-on request? On-going requirements were identified, but no funding source to cover them.
- No technical equipment costs or operational costs listed.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

Request # 2001-21

Agency	Project	Request	Match	SGC Recommendation
Board of Parole	Criminal History Integration into Corrections Tracking System (CTS)	$12,000.00	$4,000.00	$0.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Applicant's Executive Summary)

The Nebraska Board of Parole is requesting support of a grant from the Government Technology Collaboration Fund in its effort to integrate the Criminal History Assessment instrument (CHA) into the Corrections Tracking System (CTS).

The Board of Parole is proposing that the CTS be the data platform for the CHA. This project would effectively streamline the CHA process by eliminating duplication of data entry.

The following is a summary of the criteria used in implementing the Criminal History Assessment:

Nebraska Revised Statute 83-192, Subsection E (introduced in July, 1994 & implemented in July, 1996) required the implementation of an objective parole risk assessment criteria.

A Criminal History Assessment (CHA) study was developed to assist the members of the Parole Board in determining the risk factors involved when making decisions on whether to grant or deny parole at the time of an offender's initial parole review. This initial study was based upon research conducted by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCDD).

It is the Board's written policy that a CHA be completed and included in each offender's file at such time the offender is eligible for parole consideration, and included in each offender's file prior to his/her initial appearance before the Board.

The CHA instrument is completed from information compiled from offender files, pre-sentence investigation reports, and rap sheets:

- Total number of convictions (broke down into categories of assault convictions, property convictions, traffic convictions, and any other convictions)
- Total number of prison sentences (prior and current incarcerations)
- Prior parole revocations (total number of prior and current revocations)
- Age at first criminal conviction
- Age at earliest parole eligibility date
- Alcohol abuse
- Drug use

A score is given for each category listed above. The scores for each category are added and totaled which then determines the level of risk involved in paroling a particular offender.

A post-release recidivism study is completed within 24 months of an offender's parole or discharge from prison to determine the percentage of new convictions received after an offender has been discharged from prison or while an offender is on parole status.

The CHA integration into the Department of Corrections' tracking system would eliminate duplication of data that is already maintained and obtainable in such database, i.e. offender's name, institutional number, FBI number, DOB, NE SID number, race, number of prior prison sentences, prior parole revocations & dates, etc.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION
Government Technology Collaboration Fund - 2001

Application Summary Sheet

FUNDING SUMMARY

	GTCF Grant Funding	Cash Match	In-Kind Match	Other Funding Sources	**Total**
Contractual Services	**$12,000**	**$4,000**			**$16,000**
Total	**$12,000**	**$4,000**			**$16,000**

PROJECT SCORE

	Score	**Max.**
Section III: Goals and Objectives	14.7	20
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	12.3	15
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	15.3	20
Section VI: Implementation	8.0	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	8.3	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	7.7	10
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	12.3	15
TOTAL	**78.7**	**100**

REVIEWER COMMENTS

STRENGTHS

- Clear indication of objectives.
- Improves internal operations; builds on CTS
- (Neutral comment) - Not an overly complex request.
- (Neutral comment) - Reliance on IMServices identified as largest risk - IMServices is the actual provider for efforts related to the grant.

WEAKNESSES

- Based only on IMServices estimate. Although some benefit to Parole, is the intent of the grant process to subsidize budget issues?

State Enterprise Architecture

Revised: 23 October 2001

Architecture	Subsection	Work Group	Lead	Standards / Guidelines Status
Accessibility Architecture		Assistive Technology WG	Horn	**ADOPTED**: TP endorsed assistive technology clause for state contracts 12/12/2000 IN DEVELOPMENT: Accessibility policies and checklists – Draft to the TP Aug. 2001; TP recommendation Oct. 2001; NITC for approval Oct. 31, 2001
Application Architecture	To be created. (NIS; CJIS; GIS, etc.)		Schafer / Henderson	
Groupware Architecture	Directory Services	Directory Services WG	SGC	**ACTIONS**: Creating a root directory for Microsoft Active Directory users. To be completed by Aug. 2001 IN DEVELOPMENT: Reviewing enterprise directory issues. Recommendations by Dec. 2001
	E-mail	E-mail, Calendaring, and Scheduling WG	SGC	**ADOPTED**: Standards adopted for state agencies on 11/18/1997
	Calendaring and Scheduling	E-mail, Calendaring, and Scheduling WG	SGC	
	Document Management			(State Records Board)
Data and Information Architecture	GIS	GIS Steering Committee	GIS	IN DEVELOPMENT: Resolution adopted by TP on 2/13/01 requesting standards from GIS Steering Committee
	Others		Schafer / Henderson	
E-Government Architecture		E-Government WG	Schafer	IN DEVELOPMENT: Guidelines under development. GTCF grant application Aug. 2001
Hardware Architecture	NIS Project		Henderson	**GUIDANCE**: Guidance document from NIS project on PC configurations dated May 1, 2001.
	Workstations		Henderson	IN DEVELOPMENT: Draft guidelines to TP Sept. 2001; TP recommendation Oct. 2001; revisions to TP Dec. 2001
Network Architecture	NETCOM	Network Architecture WG	Decker	IN DEVELOPMENT: RFP issued Apr. 2001; bids opened Aug. 27, 2001
	Other	Network Architecture WG	Decker	
	Cabling			IN DEVELOPMENT: Draft guidelines to TP Sept. 2001; TP asked DOC for further input and revisions; revisions to be considered November 2001
Security Architecture		Security Architecture WG	Schafer	**ADOPTED**: Security policies adopted by the NITC on 1/23/01 IN DEVELOPMENT: Handbooks prepared and under review

Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Architecture	Subsection	Work Group	Lead	Standards / Guidelines Status
Systems Management Architecture	Project Status Reporting		Schafer	**ADOPTED**: Guidelines adopted 6/22/00
	Quality Assurance and Management	Work Group to be created		
Video Architecture		Video Standards WG	Beach	IN DEVELOPMENT: Draft video standards reviewed by the NITC Sept. 2001. TP recommendation Dec. 2001. NITC for approval Jan. 2002

Title	**Accessibility Policy**
Category	**Accessibility Architecture**
Date Adopted	**(DRAFT)**
Date of Last Revision	**August 22, 2001**

A. Authority

Section 86-1506 (6). "(The Nebraska Information Technology Commission shall) adopt minimum technical standards, guidelines, and architectures upon recommendation by the technical panel created in Section 86-1511."

B. Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this document is to define and clarify policies, standards, and guidelines that will help agencies meet the needs of people with disabilities.

LB 352 (2000) required the Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired, the Nebraska Information Technology Commission, and the Chief Information Officer to develop a technology access clause by January 1, 2001. The Technology Access Clause applies to all purchases of information technology. The clause includes the following provisions:

> "The intent and purpose of these standards is to ensure that the needs of Nebraskans with disabilities are met through reasonable accommodation of the information technology products and services of the state. Future information technology products, systems, and services including data, voice, and video technologies, as well as information dissemination methods, will comply with the following standards to the greatest degree possible.
>
> 1. Effective, interactive control and use of the technology including, but not limited to, the operating system, applications programs, and format of the data presented must be readily achievable by individuals with disabilities. The intent is to make sure that all newly procured information technology equipment; software and services can be upgraded, replaced or augmented to accommodate individuals with disabilities.
> 2. Information technology made accessible for individuals with disabilities must be compatible with technology used by other individuals with whom the individual with a disability must interact.
> 3. Information technology made accessible for individuals with disabilities must be able to be integrated into networks used to share communications among employees, program participants, and the public.
> 4. Information technology made accessible for individuals with disabilities must have the capability of providing equivalent access to telecommunications or other interconnected network services used by the general population.
> 5. These provisions do not prohibit the purchase or use of an information technology product that does not meet these standards provided that:
>   a. There is no available means by which the product can be made accessible and there is no alternate product that is or can be made accessible; or
>   b. The information manipulated or presented by the product is inherently unalterable in nature (i.e., its meaning cannot be preserved if it is conveyed in an alternative manner).

c. The information technology products or services are used in conjunction with an existing information technology system, and modifying the existing system to become accessible would create an undue burden.

d. The agency is able to modify or replace the information technology product with one that will accommodate the needs of individuals with disabilities.

"When development, procurement, maintenance, or use of electronic and information technology does not meet these standards, individuals with disabilities will be provided with the information and data involved by an alternative means of access."

The primary objectives of accessibility standards and guidelines include:

1. Where feasible, people with disabilities can use the same information technology systems as people without disabilities;
2. Early planning for accessibility will make it easier to provide reasonable accommodations when information technology systems are not accessible.

C. Standards and Guidelines

1. FUNCTIONAL PERFORMANCE CRITERIA (SECTION 1194.31)
   a. General-Alternative Access
      (1) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require user vision shall be provided, or support for Assistive Technology used by people who are blind or visually impaired shall be provided.
      (2) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require visual acuity greater than 20/70 shall be provided in audio and enlarged print output working together or independently, or support for Assistive Technology used by people who are visually impaired shall be provided.
      (3) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require user hearing shall be provided, or support for Assistive Technology used by people who are deaf or hard of hearing shall be provided.
      (4) Where audio information is important for the use of a product, at least one mode of operation and information retrieval shall be provided in an enhanced auditory fashion, or support for assistive hearing devices shall be provided.
      (5) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require user speech shall be provided, or support for Assistive Technology used by people with disabilities shall be provided.
      (6) At least one mode of operation and information retrieval that does not require fine motor control or simultaneous actions and that is operable with limited reach and strength shall be provided.

2. SOFTWARE APPLICATIONS AND OPERATING SYSTEMS (SECTION 1194.21)
   a. Navigation

(1) When software is designed to run on a system that has a keyboard, product functions shall be executable from a keyboard where the function itself or the result of performing a function can be discerned textually.
(2) A well defined, on-screen indication of the current focus shall be provided that moves among interactive interface elements as the input focus changes. The focus shall be programmatically exposed so that Assistive Technology can track focus and focus changes.

b. Image / Information Display
(1) Sufficient information about a user interface element including the identity, operation and state of the element shall be available to Assistive Technology. When an image represents a program element, the information conveyed by the image must also be available in text.
(2) When bitmap images are used to identify controls, status indicators, or other programmatic elements, the meaning assigned to those images shall be consistent throughout an application's performance.
(3) Textual information shall be provided through operating system functions for displaying text. The minimum information that shall be made available is text content, text input caret location, and text attributes.
(4) Software shall not use flashing or blinking text, objects, or other elements having a flash or blink frequency greater than 2 Hz and lower than 55 Hz.

c. Compatibility.
(1) Applications shall not disrupt or disable activated features of other products that are identified as accessibility features, where those features are developed and documented according to industry standards. Applications also shall not disrupt or disable activated features of any operating system that are identified as accessibility features where the application programming interface for those accessibility features has been documented by the manufacturer of the operating system and is available to the product developer.

d. Use of Color
(1) Applications shall not override user selected contrast and color selections and other individual display attributes.
(2) Color-coding shall not be used as the only means of conveying information, indicating an action, prompting a response, or distinguishing a visual element.
(3) When a product permits a user to adjust color and contrast settings, a variety of color selections capable of producing a range of contrast levels shall be provided.

e. Animation
(1) When animation is displayed, the information shall be displayable in at least one non-animated presentation mode at the option of the user.

f. Forms.
(1) When electronic forms are used, the form shall allow people using Assistive Technology to access the information, field elements, and functionality required for completion and submission of the form, including all directions and cues.

3. WEB-BASED INTERNET INFORMATION AND APPLICATIONS (SECTION 1194.22)
   a. Navigation
      (1) Redundant text links shall be provided for each active region of a server-side image map.
      (2) Client-side image maps shall be provided instead of server-side image maps except where the regions cannot be defined with an available geometric shape.
      (3) Row and column headers shall be identified for data tables.
      (4) Markup shall be used to associate data cells and header cells for data tables that have two or more logical levels of row or column headers.
      (5) Frames shall be titled with text that facilitates frame identification and navigation.
      (6) A method shall be provided that permits users to skip repetitive navigation links.
   b. Image / Information Display
      (1) Documents shall be organized so they are readable without requiring an associated style sheet.
      (2) Pages shall be designed to avoid causing the screen to flicker with a frequency greater than 2 Hz and lower than 55 Hz.
      (3) A text-only page, with equivalent information or functionality, shall be provided to make a web site comply with the provisions of this part, when compliance cannot be accomplished in any other way. The content of the text-only page shall be updated whenever the primary page changes.
      (4) When pages utilize scripting languages to display content, or to create interface elements, the information provided by the script shall be identified with functional text that can be read by Assistive Technology.
      (5) When a web page requires that an applet, plug-in or other application be present on the client system to interpret page content, the page must provide a link to a plug-in or applet that complies with the provisions of Section 2 (Software Applications and Operating Systems), above.
   c. Information Display Alternatives
      (1) A text equivalent for every non-text element shall be provided (e.g., via "alt", "longdesc", or in element content).
      (2) Equivalent alternatives for any multimedia presentation shall be synchronized with the presentation.
      (3) Use of Color
         (a) Web pages shall be designed so that all information conveyed with color is also available without color, for example from context or markup.
      (4) Forms
         (a) When electronic forms are designed to be completed on-line, the form shall allow people using Assistive Technology to access the information, field elements, and functionality required for completion and submission of the form, including all directions and cues.
      (5) Timed Responses.
         (a) When a timed response is required, the user shall be alerted and given sufficient time to indicate more time is required.

4. TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS (SECTION 1194.23)
   a. Image / Information Display
      (1) Where provided, caller identification and similar telecommunications functions shall also be available for users of TTYs, and for users who cannot see displays.
      (2) Products that transmit or conduct information or communication shall pass through cross-manufacturer, non-proprietary, industry-standard codes, translation protocols, formats or other information necessary to provide the information or communication in a usable format. Technologies which use encoding, signal compression, format transformation, or similar techniques shall not remove information needed for access or shall restore it upon delivery.
   b. Technology Links Compatibility
      (1) Telecommunications products or systems, which offer voice communication but do not include TTY functionality, shall provide a standard non-acoustic connection point for TTYs. Microphones shall be capable of being turned on and off to allow the user to intermix speech with TTY use.
      (2) Telecommunications products, which include voice communication functionality, shall support all commonly used cross-manufacturer non-proprietary standard TTY signal protocols.
      (3) Where a telecommunications product delivers output by an audio transducer which is normally held up to the ear, a means for effective magnetic wireless coupling to hearing technologies shall be provided.
      (4) Interference to hearing technologies (including hearing aids, cochlear implants, and assistive listening devices) shall be reduced to the lowest possible level that allows a user of hearing technologies to utilize the telecommunications product.
   c. Volume Control
      (1) For transmitted voice signals, telecommunications products shall provide a gain adjustable up to a minimum of 20 dB. For incremental volume control, at least one intermediate step of 12 dB of gain shall be provided.
      (2) If the telecommunications product allows a user to adjust the receive volume, a function shall be provided to automatically reset the volume to the default level after every use.
   d. Voice Mail
      (1) Voice mail, auto-attendant, and interactive voice response telecommunications systems shall be usable by TTY users with their TTYs.
      (2) Voice mail, messaging, auto-attendant, and interactive voice response telecommunications systems that require a response from a user within a time interval, shall give an alert when the time interval is about to run out, and shall provide sufficient time for the user to indicate more time is required.
   e. Controls or Keys / Physical Operation

(1) Products, which have mechanically operated controls or keys, shall comply with the following: Controls and Keys shall be tactilely discernible without activating the controls or keys.
(2) Products which have mechanically operated controls or keys shall comply with the following: Controls and Keys shall be operable with one hand and shall not require tight grasping, pinching, twisting of the wrist. The force required to activate controls and keys shall be 5 lbs. (22.2N) maximum.
(3) Products, which have mechanically operated controls or keys, shall comply with the following: If key repeat is supported, the delay before repeat shall be adjustable to at least 2 seconds. Key repeat rate shall be adjustable to 2 seconds per character.
(4) Products which have mechanically operated controls or keys shall comply with the following: The status of all locking or toggle controls or keys shall be visually discernible, and discernible either through touch or sound.

5. VIDEO AND MULTI-MEDIA PRODUCTS (SECTION 1194.24)
   a. TV
      (1) All analog television displays 13 inches and larger, and computer equipment that includes analog television receiver or display circuitry, shall be equipped with caption decoder circuitry which appropriately receives, decodes, and displays closed captions from broadcast, cable, videotape, and DVD signals. As soon as practicable, but not later than July 1, 2002, wide screen digital television (DTV) displays measuring at least 7.8 inches vertically, DTV sets with conventional displays measuring at least 13 inches vertically, and stand-alone DTV tuners, whether or not they are marketed with display screens, and computer equipment that includes DTV receiver or display circuitry, shall be equipped with caption decoder circuitry which appropriately receives, decodes, and displays closed captions from broadcast, cable, videotape, and DVD signals.
      (2) Television tuners, including tuner cards for use in computers, shall be equipped with secondary audio program playback circuitry.
   b. Video & Multi-Media
      (1) All training and informational video and multimedia productions which support the agency's mission, regardless of format, that contain speech or other audio information necessary for the comprehension of the content, shall be open or closed captioned.
      (2) All training and informational video and multimedia productions, which support the agency's mission, regardless of format, that contain visual information necessary for the comprehension of the content, shall be audio described.
      (3) Display or presentation of alternate text presentation or audio descriptions shall be user-selectable unless permanent.

6. SELF-CONTAINED, CLOSED PRODUCTS (SECTION 1194.25)
   a. Self-contained products shall be usable by people with disabilities without requiring an end-user to attach Assistive Technology to the product. Personal headsets for private listening are not Assistive Technology.
   b. Response Time

(1) When a timed response is required, the user shall be alerted and given sufficient time to indicate more time is required.

c. Controls or Keys / Physical Operation
   (1) Where a product utilizes touch screens or contact-sensitive controls, an input method shall be provided that complies with the provisions in Section 4.e, above.
   (2) When biometric forms of user identification or control are used, an alternative form of identification or activation, which does not require the user to possess particular biological characteristics, shall also be provided.

d. Audio / Voice Output
   (1) When products provide auditory output, the audio signal shall be provided at a standard signal level through an industry standard connector that will allow for private listening. The product must provide the ability to interrupt, pause, and restart the audio at anytime.
   (2) When products deliver voice output in a public area, incremental volume control shall be provided with output amplification up to a level of at least 65 dB. Where the ambient noise level of the environment is above 45 dB, a volume gain of at least 20 dB above the ambient level shall be user selectable. A function shall be provided to automatically reset the volume to the default level after every use.
   (3) Use of Color
      (a) Color-coding shall not be used as the only means of conveying information, indicating an action, prompting a response, or distinguishing a visual element.
      (b) When a product permits a user to adjust color and contrast settings, a range of color selections capable of producing a variety of contrast levels shall be provided.
   (4) Image / Information Display
      (a) Products shall be designed to avoid causing the screen to flicker with a frequency greater than 2 Hz and lower than 55 Hz.
   (5) Location Accessibility
      (a) Products which are freestanding, non-portable, and intended to be used in one location and which have operable controls shall comply with the following: The position of any operable control shall be determined with respect to a vertical plane, which is 48 inches in length, centered on the operable control, and at the maximum protrusion of the product within the 48 inch length on products which are freestanding, non-portable, and intended to be used in one location and which have operable controls.
      (b) Products which are freestanding, non-portable, and intended to be used in one location and which have operable controls shall comply with the following: Where any operable control is 10 inches or less behind the reference plane, the height shall be 54 inches maximum and 15 inches minimum above the floor.
      (c) Products which are freestanding, non-portable, and intended to be used in one location and which have operable controls shall comply with the following: Where any operable control is more than 10 inches

and not more than 24 inches behind the reference plane, the height shall be 46 inches maximum and 15 inches minimum above the floor.

(d) Products, which are freestanding, non-portable, and intended to be used in one location and which have operable controls shall comply with the following: Operable controls shall not be more than 24 inches behind the reference plane.

7. DESKTOP AND PORTABLE COMPUTERS (SECTION 1194.26)
   a. Where provided, at least one of each type of expansion slots, ports and connectors shall comply with publicly available industry standards.
   b. Controls or Keys / Physical Operation
      (1) All mechanically operated controls and keys shall comply with the provisions of Section 4.3, above.
      (2) If a product utilizes touch screens or touch-operated controls, an input method shall be provided that complies with the provisions of section 4.3, above.
   c. When biometric forms of user identification or control are used, an alternative form of identification or activation, which does not require the user to possess particular biological characteristics, shall also be provided.

D. Key Definitions

1. Agency shall mean any governmental entity, including state government, local government, or third party entities under contract to the agency.
2. Alternate formats are usable by people with disabilities and may include, but are not limited to, Braille, ASCII text, large print, recorded audio, and electronic formats that comply with this part.
3. Alternate methods are different means of providing information, including product documentation, to people with disabilities. Alternate methods may include, but are not limited to, voice, fax, relay service, TTY, Internet posting, captioning, text-to-speech synthesis, and audio description.
4. Assistive technology includes any item, piece of equipment, or system, whether acquired commercially, modified, or customized, that is commonly used to increase, maintain, or improve functional capabilities of individuals with disabilities.
5. Electronic and information technology includes information technology and any equipment or interconnected system or subsystem of equipment, that is used in the creation, conversion, or duplication of data or information. The term electronic and information technology includes, but is not limited to, telecommunications products (such as telephones) information kiosks, and transaction machines, World Wide Web sites, multimedia, and office equipment such as copies and fax machines. The term does not include any equipment that contains embedded information technology that is used as an integral part of the product, but the principal function of which is not the acquisition, storage, manipulation, management, movement, control, display, switching, interchange, transmission, or reception of data or information. For example, HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) equipment such as thermostats or temperature control devices, and medical equipment where

information technology is integral to its operation, are not information technology.

6. Equivalent facilitation provides that nothing in this part is intended to prevent the use of designs or technologies as alternatives to those prescribed in this part provided they result in substantially equivalent or greater access to and use of a product for people with disabilities.
7. Information technology is any equipment or interconnected system or subsystem of equipment, that is used in the automatic acquisition, storage, manipulation, management, movement, control, display, switching, interchange, transmission, or reception of data or information. The term information technology includes computers, ancillary equipment, software, firmware and similar procedures, services (including support services), and related resources.
8. Operable controls are the component of a product that requires physical contact for normal operation. Operable controls include, but are not limited to, mechanically operated controls, input and output trays, card slots, keyboards, or keypads.
9. Product is an electronic and information technology.
10. Self-contained, Closed Products are products that generally have embedded software and are commonly designed in such a fashion that a user cannot easily attach or install assistive technology. These products include, but are not limited to, information kiosks and information transaction machines, copiers, printers, calculators, fax machines, and other similar types of products.
11. Telecommunications are the transmission, between or among points specified by the user, of information of the user's choosing, without change in the form or content of the information as sent and received.
12. TTY is an abbreviation for teletypewriter. Machinery or equipment that employs interactive text based communications through the transmission of coded signals across the telephone network. TTY's may include, for example, devices known as TDDs (telecommunication display devices) or telecommunication devices for deaf persons) or computers with special modems. TTYs are also called text telephones.
13. Undue burden means significant difficulty or expense. In determining whether an action would result in an undue burden, an agency shall consider all agency resources available to the program or component for which the product is being developed, procured, maintained, or used.

E. Applicability

GENERAL STATEMENT

These policies are intended to be sufficiently generic to apply to a wide range of governmental and educational agencies in the State of Nebraska. Each agency or operational entity must develop detailed procedures to implement broad policies and standards. Compliance with these accessibility policies and standards will be a requirement during consideration of funding for any projects requiring review by the NITC. Compliance may be used in audit reviews or budget reviews.

COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT STATEMENT

The Governing board or chief administrative officer of each organization must develop internal compliance and enforcement policies as part of its information accessibility efforts. Such policies should be reasonable and effective. The NITC intends to incorporate adherence to accessibility policies as part of its evaluation and prioritization of funding requests. The NITC recommends that the Governor and Legislature give due consideration to requests for accessibility improvements during the budget process.

F. Responsibility

An effective program for accessibility involves cooperation of many different entities. Major participants and their responsibilities include:

1. Nebraska Information Technology Commission. The NITC provides strategic direction for state agencies and educational institutions in the area of information technology. The NITC also has statutory responsibility to adopt minimum technical standards and guidelines for acceptable and cost-effective use of information technology. Implicit in these requirements is the responsibility to promote adequate accessibility for information systems through adoption of policies, standards, and guidelines.
2. Technical Panel Accessibility Work Group. The NITC Technical Panel, with advice from the Accessibility Work Group, has responsibility for recommending accessibility policies and guidelines and making available best practices to operational entities.
3. Assistive Technology Partnership. The Nebraska Assistive Technology Partnership provides training, loan devices and support for accommodations in compliance with Section 508 and the Technology Access Clause. Training and support is available to governmental agencies, schools, businesses, and non-profit organizations.
4. University of Nebraska Accommodation Resource Center. The Accommodation Resource Center (ARC) provides training, loan devices and support for accommodation using assistive technology in both the education and employment environment. The ARC website is http://ar.unl.edu
5. Federal Information Technology Accessibility Initiative. The Federal Information Technology Accessibility Initiative (FITA) is an interagency effort, coordinated by the General Services Administration, to offer technical assistance and to provide an information means of cooperation and sharing of information on implementation of Section 508. Questions about 508 standards can be sent to 508@access-board.gov .
6. Web Accessibility Initiative The Web Accessibility Initiative has created guidelines, which are grouped by priority and are very similar to the final Section 508 rules. The guidelines can be found at http://www.w3.org/wai .
7. Agency and Institutional Heads. The highest authority within an agency or institution is responsible for accessibility of information resources that are consistent with this policy. The authority may delegate this responsibility but delegation does not remove the accountability.
8. Information Technology Staff. Technical staff must be aware of the opportunities and responsibility to meet the goals of accessibility of information systems.

G. Related Policies, Standards and Guidelines

1. Nebraska Technology Access Clause
2. Nebraska Technology Access Clause Checklist (Questions to Consider)
    a. Desktop and Portable Computers
    b. Video and Multimedia Products
    c. Software Application and Operating Systems
    d. Self-Contained, Closed Products
    e. Telecommunications Products
    f. Web Page Accessibility Questionaire
3. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act
4. Electronic and Information Technology Accessibility Standards, Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, 36 CFR Part 1194 can be found at http://www.access-board.gov/sec508/508standards.htm

TECHNICAL PANEL
OF THE
NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Information Technology Infrastructure Fund Recommendation to the NITC

October 23, 2001

A. Statutory Responsibilities of the NITC

Funding for the projects listed below comes in part from the Nebraska Information Technology Infrastructure Fund (ITIF). This funding source invokes the following statutory requirement:

"No contract or expenditure for the implementation of an enterprise project may be initiated unless the commission has approved a project plan. The project plan shall include, but not be limited to, the objectives, scope, and justification of the project; detailed specifications and analyses that guide the project from beginning to conclusion; technical requirements; and project management. The commission may request clarification, require changes, or provide conditional approval of a project plan. In its review, the commission shall determine whether the objectives, scope, timeframe, and budget of the project are consistent with the proposal authorized by the Legislature in its allocation from the fund. The Commission may also evaluate whether the project plan is consistent with the statewide technology plan and the commission's technical standards and guidelines. Pursuant to 86-1510, the Chief Information Officer shall report the status of enterprise projects to the commission, Governor, and Legislature. In addition, the Chief Information Officer shall provide the Legislature a semiannual progress report for enterprise projects funded through the fund." Neb. Rev. Stat. Section 81-1196.01

B. Projects

New Projects Receiving ITIF Funds

1. Nebraska Crime Commission - NCJIS Access to Federal Data

NCJIS (Nebraska Criminal Justice Information System) was developed to provide secure, cost effective access to a variety of data for authenticated criminal justice users. It is an Internet based data mart that currently provides access to a variety of state and local data such as criminal histories (PCH), jail bookings, corrections holds, probationers, parolees, registered sex offenders and driver histories.

This project will build on NCJIS by developing a link to NCIC (the national crime database maintained by the FBI). NCIC is currently accessed by about 125 agencies in Nebraska via dedicated lines through the NSP switch. By bridging between the switch and NCJIS we will greatly expand the use and affordable access to NCIC and other state's data at the FBI. It must be noted that this will not replace the switch but instead provides another data path.

2. DAS Division of Communications - Public Safety Wireless System RFP Process

State Statutes 86-1803 through 86-1811 outlines the Legislature's instructions to the Division of Communications for the planning and procurement of a statewide public safety wireless communications system for state agencies and other Nebraska Public Safety entities. The legislation also provided for representation through the Wireless Communications Advisory Board, which was appointed in 1999, and is comprised of local and state public safety representatives to assist the DOC in the project.

The Division of Communications issued a Request For Proposals on June 29, 2001 to conduct the competitive procurement process for the statewide wireless communications

system. Federal Engineering, an independent consulting firm, has been hired to provide procurement support from issuance of the RFP through proposal evaluation and contract award. Federal Engineering has been under contract with the DOC since the beginning of the project.

After completion of the proposal evaluations, the DOC will review the evaluation scoring results and recommendations of the evaluation team. The DOC, with assistance from the Board, will determine whether the proposals received and scoring results are sufficient to proceed with contract finalization. The DOC, with assistance from the consultant, will begin finalizing a contract with the vendor. In the event an agreement is reached the Intent-to-Award will be issued. An Interlocal agency comprised of government entities will sign and administer the Contract as stated in the RFP. This Interlocal agency will work with the Nebraska Legislature to determine the funding method and receive Legislative Approval for this funding mechanism as necessary.

The expected outcome for this project is that a public safety wireless radio system design and contract will be approved and set for implementation. This system will meet the specific needs identified by the public safety community as defined in the Statewide Public Safety Wireless Communications Plan for Nebraska.

Previously Approved Project

3. DAS - Nebraska Information System (NIS) Project

The Nebraska Information System (NIS) project will modernize State government administrative business processes. These streamlined processes will be supported by a comprehensive packaged system that integrates information for decision-making, analysis, and action. The fully integrated suite of software applications will serve the financial, human resource, and administrative business processes and reporting needs of state government agencies. The NIS would replace the current centralized accounting and payroll systems and a number of agency specific subsidiary systems.

The Department of Administrative Services is the sponsor of the NIS, but the application will serve all state agencies.

PREVIOUS NITC ACTION
On May 23, 2001, the NITC approved, with conditions, the NIS project plan.

C. Technical Panel Recommendations and Report

1. Nebraska Crime Commission - NCJIS Access to Federal Data

The Technical Panel, having reviewed the project plan on October 23, 2001, recommends that the NITC ***conditionally approve*** the project plan. The Technical Panel recommends the following condition: “A revised budget, not exceeding the $250,000 annual appropriation, is to be submitted to the Technical Panel.”

2. DAS Division of Communications - Public Safety Wireless System RFP Process

The Technical Panel, having reviewed the project plan on October 23, 2001, recommends that the NITC ***approve*** the project plan.

3. DAS - Nebraska Information System (NIS) Project

The Technical Panel, having reviewed the progress report from the NIS Project on October 23, 2001, ***reports*** that adequate progress has been made toward complying with the conditions adopted by the NITC.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Project Proposal Form

New or Additional State Funding Requests
for Information Technology Projects

Project Title	**NCJIS Access to Federal Data**
Agency/Entity	**Nebraska Crime Commission**

About this form…

This form is to be completed for all technology projects for which new or additional funding is requested from the Nebraska Legislature. An expanded description of the requests for which this form needs to be completed is available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/forms/.

For questions or comments about this form, contact the Office of the CIO/NITC at:

Mail: Office of the CIO/NITC
521 S 14th Street, Suite 200
Lincoln, NE 68508
Phone: (402) 471-3560
Fax: (402) 471-4608
E-mail: info@cio.state.ne.us

Completed forms should be submitted as an e-mail attachment to info@cio.state.ne.us or on paper to the address above.

Section I: General Information

Project Title	NCJIS Access to Federal Data
Agency (or entity)	Nebraska CrimeCommission

Contact Information for this Project:

Name	Michael Overton
Address	PO Box 94946
City, State, Zip	Lincoln, NE 68509
Telephone	402-471-3992
E-mail Address	Moverton@crimecom.state.ne.us

Section II: Executive Summary

Provide a one or two paragraph summary of the proposed project. This summary will be used in other externally distributed documents and should therefore clearly and succinctly describe the project and the information technology required.

NCJIS (Nebraska Criminal Justice Information System) was developed to provide secure, cost effective access to a variety of data for authenticated criminal justice users. It is an Internet based data mart that currently provides access to a variety of state and local data such as criminal histories (PCH), jail bookings, corrections holds, probationers, parolees, registered sex offenders and driver histories.

This project will build on NCJIS by developing a link to NCIC (the national crime database maintained by the FBI). NCIC is currently accessed by about 125 agencies in Nebraska via dedicated lines through the NSP switch. By bridging between the switch and NCJIS we will greatly expand the use and affordable access to NCIC and other state's data at the FBI. It must be noted that this will not replace the switch but instead provides another data path.

Section III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes

1. Describe the project, including: specific goals and objectives; expected beneficiaries of the project; and expected outcomes.

This project will expand on one of the main tools necessary for effective law enforcement and public safety: information. Information is maintained in a number of local, state and federal databases. These are sometimes available only locally or through very controlled means. A key effort of the CJIS Advisory Committee has been to expand access to data for a broad range of users. This will build upon our efforts to make state and local data available by expanding to federal data.

There is one main database available for national criminal data. This is NCIC (National Crime Information Center) maintained by the FBI. It collects or indexes data on crime and criminals in a standard format. States report information on things ranging from current criminal activity to warrants to criminal histories. In addition to NCIC there is an adjunct set of files called NCIS that contains Nebraska specific information but which are accessed via NCIC. These can then all be used by verified law enforcement agencies nationwide.

NCIC (and therefore NCIS) are accessed through a closed network that the FBI maintains. The Nebraska portion is called NbLETS (or sometimes NLETS). It has recently been converted to TCP/IP but is only accessed over dedicated lines to the NSP switch, a messaging switch that routes queries and replies to NCIC or NCIS. These dedicated connections are particularly essential since one of the biggest groups of users is dispatchers who need a very fast response to reply to officers in the field seeking information on traffic stops, for instance. The speed and reliability are essential in these types of situations. There are now about 125 connections.

This project will build an alternate path to NCIC. There are a number of law enforcement agencies and users who want or need federal data (such as probation officers or typical investigators) but either do not need the speed guaranteed by NbLETS or can not afford the connectivity costs. By using NCJIS as a gateway to the NSP switch we can provide greatly expanded access to a variety of users while maintaining the integrity of NbLETS.

It is anticipated that the main beneficiaries will include smaller law enforcement agencies, probation officers, parole board, corrections officers and investigators. They will then be able to access NCIC through NCJIS, over the Internet, with no anticipated additional costs.

2. Describe the measurement and assessment methods that will verify that the project outcomes have been achieved.

The obvious outcome will be a successful implementation of the interface and the ability for agencies to do queries (no input will be included).

While the technical aspects of doing this connection are challenging and will require meeting various federal constraints there are a variety of policy issues. NCIC access comes with a number of training, audit and review criteria. New policies and procedures to deal with training and ongoing oversight will be necessary. This must be implemented in a way that does not hinder or overburden current staff.

3. Describe the project's relationship to your comprehensive information technology plan.

The Crime Commission hosts the CJIS Advisory Committee as a standing committee. It is comprised of about 25 state and local criminal justice agencies and associations. While the CJIS budget is a component of the agency budget we look at the CJIS Advisory Committee and its projects as being best overseen and directed by this cooperative group. The agency's technology plan reflects the direction and priorities established by the CJIS group.

In 1997 the first CJIS Strategic Plan was completed. It was developed to establish priorities, plans and potential projects for improving statewide automation and data sharing. That plan has provided essential direction to the group ad been the basis for projects. It was updated in 2001 to reflect activities and new needs. The Strategic Plan can not be seen as a static document but instead must be seen and used as the way for agencies, using CJIS funds or their own, to move forward and measure progress. This project builds upon the goals and identified projects and needs set out in those plans.

Section IV: Project Justification / Business Case

Please provide the project justification in terms of tangible benefits (an economic return on investment) and/or intangible benefits to the agency or public. The narrative should address the following:

1. Tangible benefits: Economic cost/benefit analysis.

Economic benefits can be broken down into a few areas.

The obvious benefit is in the direct comparison of potential access for those who have no NCIC access at this time. Many smaller agencies can not afford the approximate $350 per month for NCIC terminal access. This cost covers a PC and connectivity. However, given the availability through NCJIS there will be no new costs. Agencies will be able to use an existing PC and Internet access they have for NCJIS to get to NCIC.

Broader benefits accrue when we look at multiple users. Even if an agency has current NCIC access, there will be a wide range of users that can now obtain NCIC access without having the full constraints of NCIC. Additionally, one of the ongoing concerns for NCIC is response time. By using NCJIS we will be able to more easily prioritize queries that are submitted to NCIC, thereby being sure that the workload to the switch is steady. (NCIC queries submitted through NCJIS will be given a lower priority.)

There are also a whole host of agencies, such as probation offices, that rely on criminal history information but are not typical candidates for NbLETS connectivity. By using NCJIS we can reach out to

those valid users. This takes a load off of other agencies on whom probation has relied for information. When looking at state data through NCJIS, Probation says that its officers are now saving approximately 45 minutes to 2 hours per investigation by being able to run state data over NCJIS. Considering that they do approximately 12,000 per year this saves considerable time. Without NCJIS they have to have local police or sheriffs (with NCIC access) run all background checks. While they largely rely on state data they will likewise use NCIC to check for national data.

2. Intangible benefits: Benefits of the project for customers, clients, and citizens and/or benefits of the project for the agency.

Access to information is essential for law enforcement and criminal justice. As has been easily demonstrated in any number of high visibility cases, crime and criminals are mobile. This is true not just of big crime but of small crime and reflects our changing society. NCJIS is providing better access to data from across the state but more and more we are seeing people who either travel across state lines or move across states. This makes access to national data even more critical.

Some of the aspects seen in Nebraska that reflect the need for national data are the continued use of I-80 as a drug transport route between the coasts, the large number of illegal aliens arrested in Nebraska and the rise in the use, manufacturing and distribution of methamphetamine.

3. Describe other solutions that were evaluated, including their strengths and weaknesses, and why they were rejected. Explain the implications of doing nothing and why this option is not acceptable.

NCJIS has proven to be a reliable, efficient and stable environment for sharing data. We looked at a number of alternatives but NCJIS will provide a consistent platform with solid technology to meet our needs.

One alternative is the continued and expanded use of direct connections to the switch. This creates large concerns for both initial costs as well as the ongoing costs for connectivity.

Another possibility was the use of web enabling software that has been developed by Datamaxx, maker of the switch interface. This software, called Cyberlinks, would allow broader access to the switch and is going to be deployed by the Patrol to its users. However, it appears it would require a closed network to guarantee connectivity and security. NCJIS provides a broader access path and a single environment that users are already familiar with.

It should be pointed out that two other states have implemented similar solutions for broader NCIC access. It is key that we use any knowledge gained in other states on these types of alternatives since we must have any proposal approved by the FBI prior to moving ahead.

Kansas was the first state to be granted Internet based access to NCIC. We have actually worked closely with them as we have used some of the same consultants and developers. Much of our NCJIS design and security scheme parallels theirs. We will bring in their security expert and architect to review our methods prior to moving ahead. She is also involved in the update of the FBI CJIS security standards.

Pennsylvania has a project similar to NCJIS called JNET. They are testing with the FBI a plan parallel to what we are intending. They generate a query on JNET and then pass it to their switch which then packages the request into proper NCIC format, issues the query to NCIC and then controls the reply. This mirrors our intention and should provide the basis for FBI approval of our plan. The security and policy issues will still be key.

4. If the project is the result of a state or federal mandate, please specify the mandate being addressed.

- Not a mandate -

Section V: Technical Impact

Describe how the project enhances, changes or replaces present technology systems, or if new systems are being added. The narrative should address the following:

1. Descriptions of hardware, software, and communications requirements for this project. Describe the strength and weaknesses of the proposed solution;

The majority needs of this project will rely on existing implementation. NJCIS is based upon 2 Dell NT servers that reside in IMS. They have backbone and Internet connectivity already. Along with most standard Microsoft products we use SQL and html code for the bulk of user interaction. It is anticipated that this will allow sufficient connectivity to be able to securely pass data to the NSP switch. We will need to do a fairly significant amount of programming to be able to accept and pass queries to the switch as well as receive and post replies from NCIC.

We will add one additional server to run security token software (from RSA). This will be another Dell 6400 running Windows 2000 Server.(Our current security structure relies on digital certificates that we issue. An earlier analysis recommended the use of tokens instead of certificates. We will revisit that issue as the technology has changed in the last few years. We currently use Netscape certificate manager.) We will need to boost memory on the existing servers to handle additional overhead.

2. Issues pertaining to reliability, security and scalability (future needs for growth or adaptation);

3. Conformity with applicable NITC technical standards and guidelines (available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/) and generally accepted industry standards;

There is no foreseen conflict with NITC standards and guidelines. We have focused on industry standard products and approaches to guarantee longevity and the ability to be easily flexible. We will also be driven by FBI standards for security and connectivity.

4. Compatibility with existing institutional and/or statewide infrastructure.

This project will meld well with the existing NCJIS infrastructure and the updated NSP switch. All rely on IP and standard architectures. By using IMS for support and housing we will guarantee good connectivity and consistency.

Section VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Describe the preliminary plans for implementing the project. The narrative should address the following:

1. Identify project sponsor(s) and examine stakeholder acceptance;

The CJIS Advisory Committee will be the primary sponsor for the project. The committee will maintain overall oversight and project control. Michael Overton, CJIS Chair, will be the project manager. A project subcommittee will have day-to-day project oversight. That subcommittee will be composed of Crime Commission, Nebraska State Patrol and IMS representatives as well as invited local representatives from probation and law enforcement to be sure we meet operational needs.

The CJIS Advisory Committee is composed of voting members from Clerks of the District Courts, Douglas County Information Systems, League of Municipalities, Lincoln Police Department, Nebraska Association of County Court Employees, Nebraska Association of County Officials, Nebraska Attorney General's Office, Nebraska Coalition for Victims of Crime, Nebraska Commission on Public Advocacy, Nebraska County Attorneys Association, Nebraska Crime Commission, Nebraska Criminal Defense Attorneys Association, Nebraska Department of Correctional Services, Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (Office of Juvenile Services), Nebraska Domestic Violence Sexual Assault Coalition, Nebraska Interagency Data Communications Advisory Committee, Nebraska Parole Board, Nebraska Probation Department, Nebraska Sheriffs Association, Nebraska State Court Administrator's Office, Nebraska State Patrol, Omaha Police Department, Police Chiefs Association of Nebraska, Police Officers' Association of Nebraska and a representative of County Correctional Departments. It exists to improve automation and data sharing in the criminal justice community. It is a voluntary and truly cooperative project that is ongoing only by the choice of the members. Projects such as this affect many agencies and levels of government and the CJIS group provides a way to collectively address issues and projects.

Any project must be submitted to the CJIS Advisory Committee for review and approval prior to being submitted to the Crime Commission. A Project Review Committee has reviewed and recommended projects as well as initially developed budget recommendations. The CJIS Advisory Committee adopted a Framework for CJIS Project Proposal and Strategic Plan Review which guides project adoption and the funding of all programs.

2. Define the roles, responsibilities, and required experience of the project team;

The project team is the core players who deal with and have operational oversight of NCJIS and NbLETS. The development and maintenance of the existing systems provides a solid base for the expansion of services and consistency with state and federal requirements.

Crime Commission participants will include Michael Overton (CJIS Project Manager). He has been involved in the development and design of NCJIS. State Patrol personnel will include Lt David Dishong (CID Chief), Lt Dave Shelton (CTO, head of NbLETS and communications) as well as their IT staff. Rod Lemke has been the main IMS contact and should continue in that role for this project.

Because of the nature and sensitivity of the project and the data we will need to focus a lot of our efforts on security. The two initial resources expected to be used. Norma Jean Schaffer of the Kansas Bureau of Investigation maintains security for KBI and has worked on the FBI security rules. She has agreed to help us in establishing direction and do initial review for security before we have to gain acceptance from the FBI. Fishnet Consulting is a major security consultant who did our original estimate as well as much of the Kansas design. We anticipate using them again.

3. List the major milestones and deliverables for each milestone;

This project will be driven by certain events which will then drive our timeline and the pace at which we can proceed. As mentioned earlier the Patrol is in the process of implementing a new switch. Until that is completed we can not us primary NSP resources or begin a new, major initiative. However, it does provide a prime opportunity to review the new installation and be sure that there are no glaring inconsistencies or potential problems. The new switch is to begin testing in January, 2002.

Additionally, NSP will be going through a major audit of systems related to NbLETS in November, 2001. They will be installing Cyberlinks in November, 2001. These events will allow us to begin the security design this year and move to actual implementation in 2002.

Following approval of the plan by NITC we will begin full project implementation planning. The subcommittee has met to look at resources and priorities. It is hoped that we can finalize internal reviews of NSP and FBI security considerations by December, 2001. In January, 2002 we will begin detailed security design (technical and policy). This will entail bringing in Ms. Schaffer as well as visiting Kansas. Fishnet will be contracted with for direct services. We will target having the design done by July, 2002 for presentation and approval by the FBI.

Following approval we will proceed with programming and acquisition of security components, anticipated to take six months. In this time we will formulate training and auditing plans to address new users. We should be ready to begin implementation in January, 2003.

4. Training and staff development requirements and procedures;

No training related to new processes will be necessary.

As mentioned, training and procedures for users will be necessary. We will need to develop training criteria to parallel NCIC requirements. Required onsite auditing (as well as using the transaction level tracking already built into NCJIS) and processes for compliance or removing users will need to be well documented. Regional training for existing users will probably be augmented with enhancing our current NCJIS training curriculum.

5. Ongoing support requirements, plans and provisions.

It is anticipated that there will be limited support necessary. While there will certainly be a need to change code and processes to meet new data or requirements we are envisioning putting in a system that does not collect new data nor affect databases. There will be continued use of audit code and processes at the agency level.

We currently contract with IMS for basic server support and that will continue. Analysts International (AI) has done the programming for NCJIS and administers the servers. That will continue as the servers will be seen as essential but not mission critical (as the switch is). AI provides support on security as well as the system and that expertise will continue to prove valuable. This will be covered through the standard CJIS appropriation.

Section VII: Risk Assessment

Describe possible barriers and risks related to the project. The narrative should address the following:

1. List the identified risks, and relative importance of each;

The main hurdle to address in this project is meeting FBI security considerations. We feel we have developed NCJIS with that goal and are confident in meeting and exceeding all requirements. However, as technology changes we will be forced to continually assess our position, vulnerabilities and costs. Having targeted this for years as well as being able to build upon the experience of Kansas and Pennsylvania should help us tremendously.

The need to meet FBI audit and training requirements may present real obstacles. There is limited staff at NSP who are in charge of meeting these tasks. The Crime Commission will assist in any way possible but the arrangements with the FBI require them to be the final overseers of this type of connectivity. We do not anticipate there being an ability to hire more staff in the short run and will build in as much functionality as we can using technology to limit the impact.

2. Identify strategies which have been developed to minimize risks.

CJIS has always taken a structured approach to the projects. The true cooperative attitude guarantees an approach that all involved entities must agree to. This project will not move ahead without knowledge that we can address ongoing support, training and audit concerns.

The initial planning for NCJIS targeted an eventual link to NCIC. This means that we took an early look at security and FBI needs. Combined with involvement on other state's projects this means that we are taking measured steps to concrete goals.

We had done preliminary design and gotten an initial estimate a few years ago from Fishnet Consulting for approximately $485,000. Since then we have implemented numerous technologies (new switch, NCJIS, various interfaces, etc) and the industry as well as FBI requirements have changed. We will need to review the process, design and requirements. We feel that the factors are still fairly consistent but we may ned to modify our approach.

Section VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget

1. Financial Information

   Financial and budget information can be provided in either of the following ways:

   (1) If the information is available in some other format, either cut and paste the information into this document or transmit the information with this form; or

   (2) Provide the information by completing the spreadsheet provided below.

   Instructions: Double click on the Microsoft Excel icon below. An imbedded Excel spreadsheet will be launched. Input the appropriate financial information. Close the spreadsheet. The information you entered will automatically be saved with this document. If you want to review or revise the financial information, repeat the process just described.

   
   Excel Spreadsheet
   (Double-click)

   Budget information is contained in the embedded spreadsheet. It must be pointed out that while the budget amounts and appropriations match per year there is a very real expectation that the bulk of spending will be after the first year. As mentioned, the concerns with implementing the new switch (not scheduled to begin testing until January, 2002) will drive a lot of this project. We have been told by Budget that we will be able to carry those funds over.

   The purchase of software (security token licensing) and 'other' (the tokens themselves) may occur later. Those purchases are based upon incremental additions of 1,000 user blocks.

2. Provide any on-going operation and replacement costs not included above, including funding source if known:

Ongoing operation is estimated for two factors. These will come form the CJIS appropriation for NCJIS operations.

a) housing of the new server at IMS - $125 / month
b) ongoing support of the system - $10,000 / year after 2003

Tokens will be purchased that have a life of five years. This will need to be replaced at that point. These could be replaced by state/federal funds or through local replacement.

Program management at the Crime Commission and Patrol will be part of ongoing and regular operating costs.

3. Please indicate where the funding requested for this project can be found in the agency budget request, including program numbers. Also, please provide a breakdown of all non-state funding sources and funds provided per source.

The funding appeared in the CJIS portion of the Crime Commission budget. It is in Program #215.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Project Proposal Form
Section VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget

Project Title:
Agency/Entity:

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Estimated Prior Expended	Request for FY2001/2002 (Year 1)	Request for FY2002/2003 (Year 2)	Request for FY2005 (Year 3)	Request for FY2006 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs (a)							$ -
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design		$ 25,000.00					$ 25,000.00
2.2 Programming		$ 100,000.00	$ 100,000.00				$ 200,000.00
2.3 Project Management							$ -
2.4 Other							$ -
3. Supplies and Materials							$ -
4. Telecommunications							$ -
5. Training							$ -
6. Travel		$ 5,000.00					$ 5,000.00
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
8. Capital Expenditures (b)							
8.1 Hardware		$ 23,000.00					$ 23,000.00
8.2 Software		$ 41,500.00	$ 41,500.00				$ 83,000.00
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other		$ 82,000.00	$ 82,000.00				$ 164,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	$ -	$ 276,500.00	$ 223,500.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00
General Funds		$ 276,500.00	$ 223,500.00				$ 500,000.00
Cash Funds							$ -
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ 276,500.00	$ 223,500.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 500,000.00

NOTES:

(a) If new FTE positions are included in the continuing costs/request, please provide a breakdown by position, including separate totals for salary and fringe benefits, on a separate sheet.
(b) Please itemize equipment on a separate sheet.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

Project Proposal Form

New or Additional State Funding Requests
for Information Technology Projects

Project Title	**Public Safety Wireless System RFP Process**
Agency/Entity	**DAS-Division of Communications**

About this form…

This form is to be completed for all technology projects for which new or additional funding is requested from the Nebraska Legislature. An expanded description of the requests for which this form needs to be completed is available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/forms/.

For questions or comments about this form, contact the Office of the CIO/NITC at:

Mail: Office of the CIO/NITC
521 S 14th Street, Suite 200
Lincoln, NE 68508
Phone: (402) 471-3560
Fax: (402) 471-4608
E-mail: info@cio.state.ne.us

Completed forms should be submitted as an e-mail attachment to info@cio.state.ne.us or on paper to the address above.

Section I: General Information

Project Title	Public Safety Wireless System RFP Process
Agency (or entity)	DAS-Division of Communications

Contact Information for this Project:

Name	Brenda Decker or Mike Jeffres
Address	521 South 14th Street, Suite 300
City, State, Zip	Lincoln, NE 68505
Telephone	402-471-3717 or 402-471-3719
E-mail Address	bdecker@doc.state.ne.us or mjeffres@doc.state.ne.us

Section II: Executive Summary

Provide a one or two paragraph summary of the proposed project. This summary will be used in other externally distributed documents and should therefore clearly and succinctly describe the project and the information technology required.

State Statutes 86-1803 through 86-1811 outlines the Legislature's instructions to the Division of Communications for the planning and procurement of a statewide public safety wireless communications system for state agencies and other Nebraska Public Safety entities. The legislation also provided for representation through the Wireless Communications Advisory Board, which was appointed in 1999, and is comprised of local and state public safety representatives to assist the DOC in the project.

Section III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes

1. Describe the project, including: specific goals and objectives; expected beneficiaries of the project; and expected outcomes.

RFP Procurement Support

The Division of Communications issued a Request For Proposals on June 29, 2001 to conduct the competitive procurement process for the statewide wireless communications system. Federal Engineering, an independent consulting firm, has been hired to provide procurement support from issuance of the RFP through proposal evaluation and contract award. Federal Engineering has been under contract with the DOC since the beginning of the project.

Proposal Evaluation Process (including Evaluation Tool Design and Training)

The Division of Communications and Federal Engineering are developing the proposal evaluation materials and evaluation plan, and will conduct the training for the evaluation team. This will include all instructions for executing the proposal evaluations, scoring and ranking. The DOC will oversee and review the results with assistance from the Wireless Advisory Board.

The Evaluation Team will be appointed by the DOC to analyze and score the vendor proposals. The evaluation team will be comprised of public safety professionals who are knowledgeable in communications issues including technical, management and engineering expertise, and who have no conflicting interests with this competitive procurement. Organizations whose personnel participate as evaluators, and who are not state employees, will be reimbursed for their travel and other actual expenses.

Contract Finalization and Intent-to-Award

After completion of the proposal evaluations, the DOC will review the evaluation scoring results and recommendations of the evaluation team. The DOC, with assistance from the Board, will determine whether the proposals received and scoring results are sufficient to proceed with contract finalization. The DOC, with assistance from the consultant, will begin finalizing a contract with the vendor. In the event an agreement is reached the Intent-to-Award will be issued. An Interlocal agency comprised of government entities will sign and administer the Contract as stated in the RFP. This Interlocal agency will work with the Nebraska Legislature to determine the funding method and receive Legislative Approval for this funding mechanism as necessary.

Beneficiaries and Needs Addressed

Local, state and federal public safety entities of all types have expressed interest in this project. Current state systems have lacked adequate capabilities for years and demand is high for a consolidated system with advanced technologies. Local and federal entities are increasingly seeking to coordinate with the State to address these common interests. In addition, public safety entities will be able to coordinate their equipment expenditures to invest in mutually beneficial solutions. The Legislature is anticipating cost information for the system during the 2002 legislative session. Governor Johanns has advocated implementing the system and Senator Bromm, Chairman of the Transportation and Telecommunications Committee, introduced LR 185 to explore funding options for the system.

Expected Outcomes

The expected outcome for this project is that a public safety wireless radio system design and contract will be approved and set for implementation. This system will meet the specific needs identified by the public safety community as defined in the Statewide Public Safety Wireless Communications Plan for Nebraska (See Section 4, Assessment of Alternatives).

2. Describe the measurement and assessment methods that will verify that the project outcomes have been achieved.

All scoring and ranking of the vendor proposals will be conducted on score sheets and mathematically analyzed for consistency and to reveal any anomalies or disparities in the evaluation scoring. The anticipated results of this evaluation and award process will produce the necessary information through the scoring and ranking to determine the adequacy of the proposals, and to determine the costs to implement the system.

At the conclusion of the proposal evaluation process, the DOC will determine whether adequate responses have been received. One or more sufficiently high scoring proposals that address the RFP requirements will be eligible for negotiations, beginning with the vendor(s) submitting the highest ranked proposal. If agreement can be reached with a vendor, the DOC, with approval of the Board, will issue the Intent-to-Award.

Contract award is contingent on funding. The DOC will notify the Legislature of the system costs as soon as the information can be determined. The Interlocal agency, after determining the funding method for the system, will sign and administer the Contract.

3. Describe the project's relationship to your comprehensive information technology plan.

The Public Safety Wireless Communications System is a consolidation of the State's need for radio communications and interoperability. It will replace obsolete state systems and provide the means to migrate state and local agencies onto a common infrastructure. The DOC statutory responsibilities include provisioning telecommunications services to state agencies and political subdivisions. In addition, the system will provide opportunities for ongoing coordination and collaboration with federal agencies that operate within the state and work with state and local public safety entities. This project is a specific and intregal piece of the Department of Administrative Services and Division of Communications comprehensive information technology plan.

Section IV: Project Justification / Business Case

Please provide the project justification in terms of tangible benefits (an economic return on investment) and/or intangible benefits to the agency or public. The narrative should address the following:

1. Tangible benefits: Economic cost/benefit analysis.

After the system is implemented agency investments in their own radio communications will be redirected to begin migrating user agencies onto the new system. Duplicate, incompatible expenditures will be reduced and ultimately eliminated. Future agency strategies and planning processes regarding radio communications will be directly coordinated with all participating interests as a result. Cost/benefit will be measurable through initial and long-term state agency migrations as participation grows.

2. Intangible benefits: Benefits of the project for customers, clients, and citizens and/or benefits of the project for the agency.

Local and federal public safety agencies have a large variety of perceived needs that will progressively place demands for system resources and intercommunications. Over the long-term system growth will meet these varied demands through the cooperation of a growing body of stakeholders. This will translate into increased investment in a common infrastructure and should also result in reducing the cost per user for participation.

3. Describe other solutions that were evaluated, including their strengths and weaknesses, and why they were rejected. Explain the implications of doing nothing and why this option is not acceptable.

The assessment stage of the project revealed the current situations and expectations of various local, state, tribal and federal entities in the state. While a variety of technical solutions and piecemeal technical solutions can alleviate some of the current problems, only a consolidated system approach will result in addressing the long-term joint communications needs of all users. Doing nothing is unacceptable since all public safety entities either require solutions immediately or will need the solutions within 5 years. The need for joint communications is a daily reality now and is no longer a matter of if or when it will be necessary. An assessment of an overall replacement of every piece of public safety wireless communications equipment was evaluated as too costly. The ultimate issue is how best to accomplish the objective and at what costs.

4. If the project is the result of a state or federal mandate, please specify the mandate being addressed.

There is no mandate to implement this project.

Section V: Technical Impact

Describe how the project enhances, changes or replaces present technology systems, or if new systems are being added. The narrative should address the following:

1. Descriptions of hardware, software, and communications requirements for this project. Describe the strength and weaknesses of the proposed solution;

The system requirements call for a substantially more complex and capable communications infrastructure and will provide enhanced user features, which are today necessary, but unattainable with the current systems. The proposed trunked system will replace current radios and establish the infrastructure to deploy future capabilities and required. This is not possible with the current systems. Migrating agencies to the new system will be logistically challenging, but the larger benefits in the consolidated system will far out weigh the short-term difficulties. The current RFP defines requirements

and service offerings needed by the Public Safety community, but does not identify a specific solution. The State is asking the vendor community to provide a solution to the problem identified.

2. Issues pertaining to reliability, security and scalability (future needs for growth or adaptation);

The system requirements call for a scalable approach to support the initial user agencies. The system will be able to expand as necessary to accommodate other agencies and municipalities, as well as federal agencies. Security and reliability will be similar to those of the telecommunications industry. The equipment will be available for those agencies requiring higher levels of communications security.

3. Conformity with applicable NITC technical standards and guidelines (available at http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/) and generally accepted industry standards;

The system will be accessible by any public safety or public service agency. Technical standards and guidelines will ensure uniform and efficient use of the system resources, and also provide flexible options to reduce barriers to participating. The system solution is multifaceted in that it recognizes the immediate needs of some agencies and the future needs of other potential participants. Shared infrastructure and leveraging costs will be primary motivators to participating in the system.

4. Compatibility with existing institutional and/or statewide infrastructure.

The system will utilize available telecommunications throughout the state, ostensibly through the NETCOM project. Current radio systems would be incompatible with the new system.

Section VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation

Describe the preliminary plans for implementing the project. The narrative should address the following:

1. Identify project sponsor(s) and examine stakeholder acceptance;

Senator Gene Tyson of District #19 was the initial sponsor of LB 446, Nebraska Public Safety Wireless Communication system Act, which created the Wireless Advisory Board and funded the Wireless Design Study and development of the Wireless Communications Plan for Nebraska. During the 1999 Legislative Session, the Transportation and Telecommunications Committee took over sponsorship of LB 446. Governor Johanns and Senators Bromm and Wehrbein have been instrumental in raising the awareness and need for a new public safety communications system for Nebraska public safety entities. While the legislation specifies the requirement to develop the plan for a wireless communications system for state agencies, it also recognizes the importance of providing access to local and federal agencies to enhance public safety operations, facilitate interoperability among disparate radio systems.

The Wireless Advisory Board is comprised of local and state public safety officials and has assisted the DOC since the project began in 1999. The board has represents the majority of public safety interests and concerns in the state. The board individuals represent the Department of Correctional Services, the Department of Roads, the Game and Parks Commission, the Nebraska State Patrol, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Nebraska Emergency Management Agency, the Nebraska Sheriffs Association, the Police Officers Association of Nebraska, the League of Nebraska Municipalities, the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee, professional firefighters, volunteer firefighters and emergency medical services. During the Wireless Design Study over 500 individuals participated in interviews, focus groups, public forums and surveys. There is overwhelming consensus to proceed with developing the statewide communications system, and provide non-mandatory opportunities for local government participation. Early stakeholders and potential participants have expressed widespread support in legislative hearings, local and regional conferences and at many other government events.

2. Define the roles, responsibilities, and required experience of the project team;

The Division of Communications is charged with managing the project. Federal Engineering, a private consulting agency, is assisting the DOC throughout the procurement and evaluation process, in addition to ongoing assistance from the Board. During the evaluation process the Evaluation Team will analyze and score the proposals with DOC supervision and direction from the consultant. Evaluators will be thoroughly instructed and familiar with the Wireless Communications Plan, NEVCOM RFP and evaluation materials prior to commencing the evaluation process.

Upon completion of the evaluation process, the Evaluation Team will make their recommendation to the DOC as to the top scoring vendor(s). The DOC will determine whether the proposals and Evaluation Team recommendations are adequate to proceed with contract finalization. The DOC may reject any and all proposals. If the DOC is able to finalize an agreement with the selected vendor, the DOC will then issue the Intent to Award. Contract award will be contingent on funding and approval of the funding method by the Interlocal agency.

3. List the major milestones and deliverables for each milestone;

Project milestones and deliverables have been outlined in a SOW with Federal Engineering for the following tasks:

Vendor Pre-Proposal Conference	July 23, 2001
RFP Addenda - Vendor Q&A	August 7 and August 31, 2001
DELIVERABLE: Program Management Approach	September 4, 2001
DELIVERABLE: Proposal Evaluation Materials	October 1, 2001
Vendor Proposals Due	November 2, 2001
Proposal Evaluations Completed	December 14, 2001
Vendor Best and Final Presentations	December 21, 2001
Vendor Recommendations from Consultant	January 14, 2002
Contract Negotiations Completed	February 15, 2002

4. Training and staff development requirements and procedures;

The evaluation team will undergo three days of training provided by the Division of Communications and Federal Engineering regarding the evaluation tool and procedures to be used. This training will be mandatory for all evaluation participants.

5. Ongoing support requirements, plans and provisions.

Much of the management and support functions will be handled through the Division of Communications during the RFP process under this request. Ongoing support requirements, plans and provisions will be totally dependent on the legislative action that results from the outcome of this RFP.

Section VII: Risk Assessment

Describe possible barriers and risks related to the project. The narrative should address the following:

1. List the identified risks, and relative importance of each;

Accessibility to a common system is the largest barrier to consolidating and leveraging resources. Until a common wireless infrastructure exists, agencies will continue on isolated paths or achieve a minimal level of coordination. The State is in a unique position to coordinate these common interests, which is not possible on the federal or local level.

Costs are a significant barrier to overcome before the available technical capabilities can be realized by most user agencies. Even a fully funded infrastructure will not mitigate the cost of purchasing new subscriber radios. Ongoing coordination, state assistance and progressive migration will be necessary in order to leverage the full benefits of the system.

Understanding the technical requirements and value of sharing spectrum resources must be an ongoing function of the State and User Board. No single entity can become of full participant of the system without a willingness to cooperate with the larger system goals and intent. Ongoing coordination between the interests of each entity and expanding the system will require long-term commitments from participating entities to be successful.

2. Identify strategies which have been developed to minimize risks.

All state agencies will migrate to the system. This will provide a necessary catalyst for the State to be an anchor tenant of the system. As system resource-sharing increases, cost per user will decrease and should further minimize subscriber fees. The wireless infrastructure will provide the necessary platform to deploy other necessary technologies such as mobile data, location technology and Computer Aided Dispatching. Investment by all levels of government will contribute to the value of the system and encourage further migrations.

Section VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget

1. Financial Information

Financial and budget information can be provided in either of the following ways:

(1) If the information is available in some other format, either cut and paste the information into this document or transmit the information with this form; or

Contracted Services (Federal Engineering)	$76,780
Contracted Services (Evaluators)	$12,000
Contracted Services (Personnel)	$154,575
Radio Comm Manager Salary & Benefits (75%)	$44,500
Travel Expense	$ 3,500
Telecommunications	$ 600
Supplies	$ 1,000
Office Space	$ 8,500
Hardware	$12,000
Software	$5,000
Total	$318,455

(2) Provide the information by completing the spreadsheet provided below.

Instructions: Double click on the Microsoft Excel icon below. An imbedded Excel spreadsheet will be launched. Input the appropriate financial information. Close the spreadsheet. The information you entered will automatically be saved with this document. If you want to review or revise the financial information, repeat the process just described.

Excel Spreadsheet
(Double-click)

2. Provide any on-going operation and replacement costs not included above, including funding source if known:

The DOC initially contracted with Federal Engineering, which was funded through LB 446 (1999). This funding period ended June 30, 2001. The remaining requirements of the legislation call for selecting a qualified Contractor though competitive procurement. The DOC negotiated an SOW with Federal Engineering for procurement support through contract award.

The Legislature appropriated $1.5M for FY2002-03 into the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund, Program No. 240 to support implemementing the public safety communications system project. This RFP Evaluation and Award Process will complete several necessary steps toward fulfilling the statutory requirements and Governor Johanns' intent toward implementing the system.

3. Please indicate where the funding requested for this project can be found in the agency budget request, including program numbers. Also, please provide a breakdown of all non-state funding sources and funds provided per source.

Information Technology Infrastructure Fund, Program No. 240.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Project Proposal Form
Section VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget

Project Title: Public Safety Wireless System RFP Process
Agency/Entity: DAS - Division of Communications

(Revise dates as necessary for your request.)

	Request for FY2002 (Year 0)	Request for FY2003 (Year 1)	Request for FY2004 (Year 2)	Request for FY2005 (Year 3)	Request for FY2006 (Year 4)	Future	Total
1. Personnel Costs (a)							$ -
Radio Comm Mgr (75%)	$ 33,000.00						$ 33,000.00
Benefits for RCM (75%)	$ 11,500.00						$ 11,500.00
2. Contractual Services							
2.1 Design							$ -
2.2 Programming							$ -
2.3 Project Management							$ -
Federal Engineering Inc.	$ 76,780.00						$ 76,780.00
Contract Svs w/eval.'s	$ 12,000.00						$ 12,000.00
2.4 Other							$ -
Grants Coordinator	$ 46,575.00						$ 46,575.00
Network Manager	$ 60,750.00						$ 60,750.00
Admin Assistant	$ 33,750.00						$ 33,750.00
Support Staff (50%)	$ 13,500.00						$ 13,500.00
3. Supplies and Materials	$ 1,000.00						$ 1,000.00
4. Telecommunications	$ 600.00						$ 600.00
5. Training							$ -
6. Travel	$ 3,500.00						$ 3,500.00
7. Other Operating Costs							$ -
Rent/Space	$ 8,500.00						$ 8,500.00
8. Capital Expenditures (b)							
8.1 Hardware	$ 12,000.00						$ 12,000.00
8.2 Software	$ 5,000.00						$ 5,000.00
8.3 Network							$ -
8.4 Other							$ -
TOTAL COSTS	$ 318,455.00	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 318,455.00
General Funds							$ -
Cash Funds							$ -
Federal Funds							$ -
Revolving Funds							$ -
Other Funds							$ -
TOTAL FUNDS	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

NOTES:

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
Project Proposal Form
Section VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget

(a) If new FTE positions are included in the continuing costs/request, please provide a breakdown by position, including separate totals for salary and fringe benefits, on a separate sheet.
(b) Please itemize equipment on a separate sheet.

The Nebraska Information Technology Commission required the following conditions for the release of Information Technology Infrastructure funds for the NIS project. Each requirement and its status is listed below.

Requirement:

Need for tangible evidence of agency commitment such as providing project team members, incorporating agency training plans per project implementation plans, participation in design workshops, and providing executives for the process decision team.

Status:

Agency directors voiced their support for the project on July 2, 2001 at a Director's staff meeting.

Governor Johanns, Treasurer Byrd and Auditor of Public Accounts Witek spoke in support of the project at the NIS kickoff meeting on October 9, 2001. 350 state employees from over 40 agencies attended the meeting. Informal comments from the attendees were very positive.

The project team includes full time members from DAS, HHS, Education, Roads, NET, DEQ, DNR, Corrections and Military. Other agencies have indicated a willingness to supply team members as required.

The process decision team (PDT) includes HHS, Roads, Education, Game & Parks, DEQ, DAS, Auditor of Public Accounts, Secretary of State, Corrections, Arts Council and Labor. Tom Lamberson from DEQ chairs the team.

The first workshops have been well attended by a variety of agencies. Training assessments are being scheduled. The assessments will be used to design training plans.

Requirement:

Written empowerment from the Project Sponsor allowing the Project Director and the NIS Project Team to make time critical decisions.

Status:

We have obtained a copy of the University empowerment letter and of a sample from IBM. The initial PDT task has been to define the boundaries of empowerment for the PDT, the project team and the steering committee. This information will be the basis for written empowerment statements.

Requirement:

Detailed process for evaluating and eliminating duplicative systems.

Status:

The discovery process for duplicative systems has started with a review of current interfaces to NEIS and NAS. A request for information has also been prepared to gather information about agency-specific financial systems. This information will be used as input for the evaluation. After the discovery process, the NIS project team will work with agencies to compare functionality and analyze different options. Decisions on what constitutes a duplicative system and when to eliminate it will follow the requirements established by the NIS Steering Committee as specified in the NIS project charter:

"Large State agencies have compensated for the lack of functionality in the state's accounting, payroll, and other enterprise systems by developing their own computer programs. Often these programs are closely tied to other agency-owned automated systems. In some cases, the functionality serves needs unique to the agency. The new Nebraska Information System will duplicate some of the functions in some agency-owned applications. State agencies will shift these functions to NIS, unless there is a clear cost advantage to retaining the agency-owned system. Unique requirements of the agency or following nationally recognized best practices are reasons for retaining agency-owned systems, if those systems are able to provide NIS with the data it requires. The timetable for shifting functions to NIS will take into consideration the availability of resources in state agencies to make corresponding changes to agency-owned systems, which are to be completed by 6/30/2005."

Specific decision criteria will be established by year-end 2001 for use in NIS design workshops.

Requirement:

Detailed description of the NIS project scope, including base functionality and management of contingency funds to address unforeseen events.

Status:

The NIS project scope is defined in the NIS contract. It includes full implementation of the following J.D. Edwards OneWorld XE modules:

OneWorld® Xe Modules	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	Phase IV	Phase V
Address Book Management	**X**				
General Ledger	**X**				
Financial Reporting	**X**				
Accounts Payable	**X**				
Accounts Receivable	**X**				
Procurement	**X**				
Electronic Commerce	**X**				
Human Resources		**X**			
USA Payroll		**X**			
Financial Modeling and Budgeting				**X**	
Contract Management			**X**		
Grant Management			**X**		
Project Accounting/Job Costing			**X**		
Fixed Assets			**X**		
Inventory Management					**X**

Relevant sections from both the RFP and the J.D. Edwards proposal that describe the project scope are also included in the contract.

Contingency funds will be managed at the Steering Committee. The Project Director will identify proposed uses for the funds. The Steering Committee will approve or deny the proposed expenditures.

Requirement:

Contract negotiations result in a total project budget not to exceed $29,728,529.

Status:

The contract negotiations resulted in a total project budget of $29,331,177.

Requirement:

Prepare a realistic post implementation budget.

Status:

An initial post implementation budget was developed. Support cost estimates derived from this initial budget were shared with all agencies in June.

Paul Carlson, who will be responsible for the ongoing support of NIS after the project ends, is now refining the budget for approval by the project sponsor Lori McClurg. Our goal is to have a final approved post implementation budget that will include adequate staff and resources to allow ongoing training and technical support necessary to achieve the benefits identified in the project charter.

Requirement:

Development of an independent project management review process that involves state government representation and management.

Status:

Agreement has been established with IBM for a representative of the State Chief Information Officer to participate in the independent IBM quality management review of the project. The quality review is completely independent of the project team.